

CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

October — December 1957

LONDON

S · P · C · K

1957

*Published by S.P.C.K.
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

EDITORIAL

MANY of us will have heard with a pang of regret the decision of the Central Society of Sacred Study to terminate its activities at the end of the current year. We have enjoyed its assistance in our reading for over half a century and we view its approaching demise with some dismay. Our dismay is not lessened by the fact that one of the reasons given for the decision is "rising costs". We are becoming all too familiar with this cause for the cessation of good work. Even as we write, one of the great national weeklies announces that it must cease publication for the same reason. Is there to be no end to inflation and its consequences? A happier reason for the termination of C.S.S.S. is that, owing to the appearance of other aids to clerical study, "the Society's efforts have to a large extent become superfluous". It is suggested that some of these agencies may take on where the Society leaves off. We notice with interest an explicit reference to the *Church Quarterly Review* and hasten to accept the implied challenge. We have always thought that one of the most important features of the work of C.S.S.S. was the publication of "progress reports" from the various departments of theology. Few things are more valuable to the student than an occasional review of the work done in his particular field during recent years. We shall hope from time to time to publish such accounts from well-known scholars. We are happy to say that Ulrich Simon, whose masterly article on Demythologizing will be remembered, has promised to start us off with an outline of recent work on the Old Testament.

We publish in this number an unexpected letter on the current theological use of the word "myth"—unexpected because we thought that any opportunity of complaint on this head had gone by default. Is it really too late to ask our biblical theologians to exercise special care in the use of this word? The second edition of the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* explains the term as meaning "A purely fictitious narrative. . . . Often used vaguely to include any narrative having fictitious elements." The emphasis is evidently

upon the fiction, and that is certainly the sense in which the word is taken by the man in the street. Unfortunately many of our theologians now claim to use the word to describe biblical narratives without reference to the presence or absence in them of strictly historical material. This appears to approximate to the usage described in the dictionary as vague. Our correspondent evidently feels that such a practice is both unscholarly and dangerous; and we agree with him. Scholars who are meticulously careful in their handling of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin should be equally scrupulous in their use of their own language. The matter is of more than academic interest. A diocesan bishop of very considerable ability was recently heard to say that the clergy ought to explain to their people more clearly than they do how much of myth there is even in the New Testament. Preachers who follow this advice ought to be warned that the man in the pew will certainly understand by the term "myth" something that is actually fictitious, and he will have the dictionary behind him. If scholars want a word to express a parabolic element in a biblical story and find poetry, folklore, legend, allegory insufficient, why not go back to the term "mythus" (with a long y!)? It also finds a place in the dictionary as an equivalent of "myth", but is less well known and will at least require explanation. The layman will thus be prevented from jumping to the conclusion that the speaker is referring to something "purely fictitious".

The reception that has been accorded north of the border to the report on the relations between the Presbyterian and Anglican churches has come as a surprise—a welcome surprise but still a surprise. It had always been expected that negotiations with the Presbyterians would be more difficult than with other Reformation or post-Reformation churches. The difficulty did not lie merely in their rejection of episcopacy, but in their possession of a far more solid body of theology than the rest of such churches. To this solidity it was believed the influence of Karl Barth, which is much greater among Scots than English theologians, had added renewed strength. It might have been expected therefore that the report would have been received with much more coldness than was actually shown. It appears, however, that with a consciousness of doctrinal strength has come increased flexibility. It is noteworthy too that some of the foremost Scottish theologians share to the full the

ecumenical concern that is so marked a feature of the present generation of Anglicans overseas, and they have indeed provided some of the leaders of the ecumenical movement. Hence the obvious desire to treat the report with sympathy, though one can quite understand and appreciate the element of reserve. At the moment of writing there has been no opportunity of testing at all adequately the Anglican reaction, but one may venture to forecast that it will be of much the same nature. In any case it is to be hoped that these discussions will not in any way delay the talks that are going on with the Methodists. The situation there is very different and even more hopeful. It should continue to be pursued quite independently.

ANTICIPATIONS OF LAMBETH

MARCUS KNIGHT

IN PREPARATION for the Lambeth Conference to be held in 1958 the S.P.C.K. has recently issued a number of reports by Advisory Councils on various important topics. The Archbishop of Canterbury has written for each of these a foreword which is chiefly explanatory, but inevitably acts as a commendation of the material for study by the Church and general public. What the Bishops may say at the end of their deliberations will be possibly remote from the opinion of the rest of us unless we have had some opportunity of sharing with them in thinking about the same topics as they have to think about. These reports provide the opportunity for the general reader to share in a similar approach to the questions for discussion, and also provide a great deal of useful information. They are educational pamphlets which cannot but widen the sympathies and enlarge the minds of all who read them.

There are before us four of these documents, one of which considers the world-wide Anglican Communion and its missionary task, one deals with ways towards possible unity with Presbyterianism, and two consider various questions of Prayer Book Revision, examining both the principles on which action should be based and some practical proposals which might be approved.¹

It is always useful to set a domestic question within a wider context, and as Lambeth is essentially a gathering together of those who are Fathers in God to men and women of every race, colour, and nationality one must aim at catching something of this world-wide vision which is stimulated by the membership of the Conference. The first of these pamphlets is the work of Dr Max Warren, General Secretary of the C.M.S. His essay has been read by other

¹ *Missionary Commitments of the Anglican Communion.* S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

Principles of Prayer Book Revision. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England. (A Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission.) S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

members of the Advisory Council on Missionary Strategy and revised in the light of comments made by them, so that it has more authority than the writer's, although his is indeed the authority of a missionary statesman. In a short historical survey of the growth of the Anglican Communion, he shows how a pattern emerged "of a sending Mother Church—a receiving daughter Church—and a daughter Church in turn becoming a sending Church". One of the most remarkable results of historic factors has been that Anglicanism has become safeguarded from dependence upon the political fortunes of the British Empire. "Self-governing, self supporting, self-propagating Churches" have emerged, or are on the way to emergence, and there is a flexibility and vitality about this which fills one with hope.

Some important questions are raised about strategy, when the Report calls attention to economic changes in Great Britain which have concentrated interest on domestic questions at home and reduced interest in overseas problems. The revolt of Asia and Africa against the West has consequences which must affect missionary work, and there is a tendency in these areas to demand United Churches which are in a position to speak to the nationalist situation. The rise of the United States of America to the dominant position in the free world means that she is now the most powerful nation in the Pacific area, and this must have effects particularly upon Australia. In terms of missionary outreach we must expect that the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. may well become the senior partner in the Anglican Communion. This is, however, still a long-term development, and in the meantime it must be remembered that the Episcopal Church represents only a small section of the religious life of the U.S.A. and cannot therefore be expected to undertake vast commitments which are beyond her resources.

The Report provides a great deal of factual information about the present missionary commitments of the various Provinces of the Anglican Communion. No part of the world seems to fall outside these commitments entirely. Attention is rightly called to the provision of literature, and more especially to the services of the S.P.C.K. to the whole Anglican Communion, with special reference to its commitments in Asia and Africa.

In consideration of the demands made upon the Anglican Communion in the U.S.A. and Canada we are reminded that in both countries there are large demands for missionary tasks within

these lands. In the Far West and Far North there are movements of population and the opening up of new territories which call for men and money, and the overseas commitments must be seen within the context of the total demand upon the resources of both Churches. One important fact is emphasized so far as the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A. is concerned, and that is that in the Caribbean, the Philippines, South America, and elsewhere Anglican missionary enterprise is being conducted within countries which are primarily Roman Catholic. There is need for study of the apologetic put forward by the Episcopal Church to justify this work, both as to Roman Catholic claims to have covered these countries, and as to the acute weaknesses of Rome in providing staff and opportunities for evangelism in these lands. Those who are concerned at home in meeting Roman Catholic claims might well examine this situation as it presents itself overseas and make some contact with representatives of the Episcopal Church who are facing the same question in a vigorous way in areas far from Great Britain.

After reading through the careful survey of the outreach which so many Provinces of the Anglican Communion are making in so many areas one is bound to be encouraged by the vitality and sacrifice represented by all this enterprise. This is a picture of the Anglican Communion seeking to preach the Gospel to all nations, and if all our people could be seized of the drama and romance of this world-wide undertaking there would surely be a far deeper understanding of the missionary responsibility and of what it means to be a member of this Anglican Communion. Have people's imaginations been stimulated yet? Have the old pictures of the simple teacher with a few coloured people gathered around him under a tree been changed into new pictures of the present situation and of the way in which Anglicans from so many countries are fulfilling the sending—receiving—sending pattern?

The Report also lays stress upon the growth of the ecumenical spirit in so much overseas work. Growing association in work among Christian men and women of different traditions leads to growing understanding; this in turn leads towards co-operation in many fields, and this again to a growing hope of organic unity. Everything points to a deeper involvement of the Anglican Communion within the Ecumenical Movement, for the position in Asia and Africa is such that the new independent States are not disposed to deal with denominations but only with such bodies as National

Christian Councils. It is of the highest importance that Anglicanism takes its full part in these Councils, for its witness may otherwise go by default, and the distinctive witness of the Anglican Communion must be made clear in all such discussions.

The Report is full of imaginative suggestions about areas of Christian responsibility which touch us all practically. So many laymen or women are now going overseas in Government, academic, medical, commercial, scientific, and technical projects that each of them must be regarded as a missionary for good or evil to those among whom they will work. It will be necessary to persuade many of them to welcome the ministry of native-born priests in such lands. Many such priests will be visiting this land too. How many British or American Churchmen ever have the opportunity of receiving the Sacraments from men of another race or colour, or of hearing the Word expounded by them? New and imaginative ways are demanded so that this can happen more often than it does. Colleges such as St Augustine's, Canterbury, might grow in scope in size, while exchanges of clergy between different parts of the Anglican Communion would do much to stimulate a wider sense of the Church Universal. There are new problems arising from the needs of coloured communities in Great Britain, and also of the needs of students from Africa, India, and other lands.

With the revival of religions such as Islam, Buddhism, and Hinduism as part of the present Nationalist movements across the world, there is need for better theological training, for specialized work, for new literature, for the encouragement of the best Christian leadership in Asia and Africa, and for constant cross-fertilization of minds between representatives of East and West within the Anglican Communion. Why not a second Minneapolis, it is asked, somewhere in Asia or Africa, and perhaps a third in Australasia and so on? The educational results of such congresses would be valuable in the extreme. It is on the note of education that the Report concludes. The demand for deeper spiritual responsibility and more adequate educational effort remind the ordinary Anglican of the vast opportunities before us, and of the great gap that there is between the need which exists and the ordinary man's realization of it.

It is against this world-wide background of Church life and work that one should study the second of the Reports, on *Relations between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches*. Although that

Report deals particularly with the situation in Great Britain, it must be remembered that there are vast numbers of Presbyterians in the United States and elsewhere, and that the Presbyterians have close relationships with the Protestant churches of Europe. It will not be easy to isolate any action taken in Great Britain from repercussions elsewhere. It was not long ago that very similar proposals for closer integration between the Episcopal Church and Presbyterianism in the U.S.A. were rejected by the Episcopal Church, very largely on the ground that the distinctive witness of Anglicanism would be swallowed up and lost in the larger integration. In Great Britain this anxiety may well be transferred in the other direction, and the fears among Presbyterians of the loss of their own distinctive witness may mean that they will be the more difficult partners in any negotiations likely to arise.

A few Presbyterian Ministers and laymen have already voiced such fears, and made a criticism which indicates an attitude one must recognize and regret. Their criticism is based upon the fact that too few working Ministers were engaged in the discussions leading to the Report, and too many University Professors are responsible for it. As it is inevitable that the best theologians should be called upon to deal with theological issues, this seems an unworthy kind of criticism, but it is a warning to the Churches engaged in discussions that in the end it is the working clergy who have to be brought along to the level of the theologians, and that it is the laity who then have to be lifted to the level of the working clergy. In all these discussions leaders are apt to get very far ahead of followers, and the commendation of this Report for study by clergy and laity alike must be warmly supported. The informative material in the Report is substantial, and it is to be hoped that people will read, mark, and carefully digest it. Only so will they understand what is implied by "bishops-in-presbytery" and "laymen in participation". The Presbyterian churches have the "Highest" doctrine of the Church among non-Episcopal churches, and there is thus much common ground theologically with ourselves. Each side understands what the other is concerned for, and the Report is filled with a spirit of sympathy and Christian understanding which in itself must do much to heal old wounds and long-standing suspicions. Action may not yet be possible, but it will never be possible until this Report has become part of the common thinking of Presbyterians and Anglicans in Great Britain.

Two Reports deal with matters which affect Anglicans in their domestic life and more especially in their ways of worship. *Principles of Prayer Book Revision* is a substantial document. It has been prepared by the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon with special reference not only to proposals for Prayer Book Revision, and to current opinion on liturgical matters within that church, but also to liturgical developments in the Church of South India. The importance of this study depends upon the accepted truth that "the Book of Common Prayer holds a cardinal place in the unity of the Anglican Communion as providing a norm of its worship and a classical expression of its doctrine". The Commission was asked to review all the existing revisions of the Prayer Book anywhere in use in the Anglican Communion, to examine proposals before the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, to consider general opinion on liturgical matters current in that church, and to direct attention to liturgical developments in the Church of South India. This large undertaking has been faced and dealt with in a way which testifies to the scholarship and industry of those taking part.

The Report calls attention to the general desire for enrichment by the many additions for festivals and seasons, but notes that this endangers the principles in the Preface to the 1549 Prayer Book, in which the regular reading of the Bible and Psalter was to suffer the minimum of interruption. They note that the Americans have gone further than anyone else in the dislike of archaisms. Kalendars have been enriched, and they point out that it is desirable to correct the inference which might be drawn from many Kalendars that "the more heroic forms of sanctity were confined to the ancient and medieval periods of Church History". The Commission hopes that it will be possible to obtain a uniformity throughout Anglicanism on days of fasting and abstinence, and also on Holy Days and the rules for transferring Saints' Days. There is an awareness of the danger which can arise with the provision of large numbers of variable Collects, Epistles, and Gospels of upsetting the balance achieved in 1662 and even of disturbing its doctrinal proportions. The problem of the Catechism is briefly mentioned on p. 15 but remains as one of the more important matters on which action ought not to be long delayed. After a fascinating and most informative review of all the revisions they point to five general conclusions: the value of reading parts of the Apocrypha in the

lectionaries, the general satisfaction with the traditional Liturgical Epistles and Gospels, the adequacy of the Sunday and Festal Collects, the lack of logical structure in the Order for the Burial of the Dead, and the need not to permit the "Quincunque vult" to be entirely forgotten, for there is no better corrective to popular tritheism. It is of course the damnatory part of this which has done the damage, but 1928 did permit the omission of the two damnatory verses.

In considering rites of Christian Initiation the Report notes the difficulty all revisers face of rewording the first exhortation and asks whether Biblical Theology may be able to find the right way of restating the Pauline contrast between humanity as it was in Adam and humanity as it is in Christ. The Preface to the Confirmation Service in 1928 is also criticized. "The strictures which have been passed on the unfortunate preface of 1928 are in our opinion largely justified; it cannot be gainsaid that the Revisers in the endeavour to rectify one confusion have introduced a fresh incoherence." It seems clear that there is room for a great deal of new thinking about Rites of Initiation. One interesting fact is mentioned by the Commission. In their own Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon great emphasis is laid in the Confirmation service on the duty of bearing witness, and Acts 1. 8, with its emphasis on that duty, has been woven into a revised preface.

The survey of the Holy Communion Service is a valuable précis both of the history of the Liturgy and also of the various revisions. As is so clearly pointed out, the tension within Anglicanism arises from the fact that one type of Eucharistic Liturgy stems from the 1549 rite and the other from the 1552 rite, and the whole Anglican Communion reflects in its worship this tension. This is not necessarily a matter for regret, for such tensions can be fruitful, but variety of emphasis is inevitable. The Report says that three deficiencies in 1662 can be discerned in the light of Liturgical and Biblical research. One is the absence of any formula making remembrance before God of the saving acts commemorated, another is its concentration on the death of Christ without adequate balancing reference to the Resurrection, Exaltation, and Return; and the other is the meagreness of the Eucharistic element in a prayer which developed out of the thanksgiving uttered by our Lord at the Last Supper. On the other hand, Cranmer's great work was to rediscover the congregation. "We owe it to the

reformers that the Anglican Church is equipped with a Liturgy which enables and encourages her children to fulfil their bounden duty as members of a worshipping community."

Recent revisions show a tendency to group penitential matter in an introductory act of preparation at the beginning of the service; to bring out the significance of the Offertory; to improve the prayer for the Church; to contain an Anamnesis and in certain cases an Epiclesis; and to transfer the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer to the 1549 position preceding Communion. One of the difficulties which faces all revisers is that their method is usually to enrich an existing rite by the use of ancient sources both Eastern and Western and at the same time to preserve phrases enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer rite consecrated by centuries of use, and thus redundancy and reduplication too often occur.

A detailed examination of the Revision used in the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon forms part of this Report. Within the pattern of the sending—receiving—sending church this revision deserves to be carefully studied, and there is no reason why Anglicans at home should not learn something from Anglicans overseas in attempting to revise our own Prayer Book. The fact which cannot be ignored is that our Prayer Book has on the whole vindicated its capacity to provide a pattern of worship which can be meaningfully used by the races of other lands very diverse in culture and tradition from the land of its origin. On the other hand, it has not been so successful in exporting to the Asiatic countries the traditional forms of Morning and Evening Prayer, and for these there is urgent need of alternatives. On page 104 the Commission sets out thirteen questions which call for further enquiry and research, and it is to be hoped that both the Report and these questions will commend themselves to clerical study and discussion in the immediate future.

The fourth Report is that made by the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England, under the Chairmanship of the Dean of Lincoln, and published under the title *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*. It begins with the Chairman's statement that "The revision of the B.C.P. can take place satisfactorily only if there is general agreement about the principles on which it should be carried out". The Commission, which represented all "schools of thought" within the Church, hopes that their Memorandum will "help to bring about this general agreement and to establish the

right relationship of confidence and understanding between the Church of England as a whole and its Liturgical Commission”.

Their first major conclusion is that the wholeness of the ideals of the reformers as expressed in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer have been modified to a greater or lesser extent either by deliberate intent or by the erosions of history. Yet in spite of this the Book of Common Prayer has produced a characteristic “ethos” of worship different from that of any other Communion, Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Free Church, or Continental Protestant. Unfortunately, criticism has usually been on a party basis, and the official reply to it from 1662 onwards was to allow only small alterations and to seek rather to preserve peace than to guide the Church towards an improved set of forms for the worship of God. Has the time now come when such a move is possible? There are signs which are hopeful.

The Report then summarizes the history of the attempts at revision, with special reference to the developments between 1906 and 1928. The most probable reason for the defeat of the 1928 revision was, in the words of the Bishop of Chichester, “the attempt to do two things at once—to revise Church services, and to obtain an instrument for stopping disobedience”. But in fact the two are never entirely separated from one another, and in the end it goes back to the fact that “the Church of England has never made up its mind about the limits of its comprehensiveness”.

Since 1928 there have arisen new factors which must bear upon any fresh revision. These include the revival of Biblical Theology, the recovery of the doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, and developments in society which have made for a more definite understanding of what membership of the Church means in a more secular type of community. There is a new understanding of the doctrine of the laity. The Liturgical Movement has had a profound effect, and a notable development is that of the Parish Communion. If this development continues it will be necessary to provide Psalmody and Old Testament Lesson for it if worshippers are to have an adequate sense of the wholeness of God’s Revelation.

The Commission calls attention to the need of a revised Baptism service, more intelligible than that of 1928 and more integrated into the life of the worshipping Church. There are now many more adult Baptisms, and this office also needs revision. Little reference is made in this Report to Confirmation, but it is understood that the

whole question of Christian Initiation is still under consideration, and there are many unresolved theological issues which must be taken into account.

This Memorandum speaks warmly of rising standards in Church music, although one wonders whether it is too complacent in saying that "the country's first composers have been ready to write for religion and the Church". Elgar is dead and Vaughan Williams is very aged; are there many signs of fresh work coming forward from our Cathedrals? In view of the fact that the services for the Churching of Women and for the Burial of the Dead make such an impact upon so many, it is strange that this Memorandum makes no reference to them. Nor indeed does it comment upon the Order of Holy Matrimony.

What principles then are to be basic for any revision? The Memorandum suggests that no revolutionary revision is called for. Revision should be faithful to the traditional Anglican principle that provided they are not repugnant to Holy Scripture forms of worship are within the Church's competence to settle. Expression must also be given to the theological and liturgical insights of our time, and must be related to the world of thought and life in which the Church's task has to be done. The Prayer Book is itself caught up into the general problem of communication and relevance, and one can foresee that it is here that many controversial aspects may arise, for people vary on how best to solve this question of communication. The Prayer Book must convey a true doctrine of God, and at the same time, as this Memorandum rightly says, provide "an enriched, worthier, and more fitting vehicle for the worship of God in the Church of England".

There is an Appendix to this Memorandum which contains a collection of passages from recommendations of Lambeth Conferences beginning from 1867 and continuing through to 1948. This is in itself a sign of the growing concern through this period for the Prayer Book and also gives an insight into the general mind of the Anglican Communion in approaching questions of revision.

It has not been possible to do more than summarize some of the more important points in these four documents. They should be carefully read, and they can be commended to clergy and laity alike. Few ordinary churchgoers have any imaginative conception of what it means to belong to the Anglican Communion, and a study of these documents is itself a stimulus to wider imagination.

Might not some moribund Chapters of clergy find new interest if some of their members were to examine revisions now in use, or proposed for use, in other parts of the Anglican Communion, and seek to discover the value of the revisions and the reasons for changes recommended? How many of the clergy have any knowledge, for instance, of the Prayer Books of the Scottish Episcopal Church and of the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church of the U.S.A.? There are areas of almost untouched experience which need to be explored here, and if revisions coming into use in Asia are also examined there will be a new interest in the whole question of worship, and a new attitude may develop towards Prayer Book Revision in England. These documents are therefore of educational value to the whole Church. No recommendations from Lambeth will be of much avail unless Churchpeople understand the reasons for the recommendations, and have some sympathy with the purposes of the policy. These reports suggest that the leadership of the Anglican Communion is, in at least these fields, aware of the problems and needs of the present age. But they are well ahead of the average membership in their thinking and in the information to which they have access. Only through a programme of educational discussion in the parishes can the gap in some measure be closed. These documents are a contribution to the necessary consultation and communication which are required, and should do much to create the right atmosphere for subsequent action.

KENNETH KIRK AS MORAL THEOLOGIAN

V. A. DEMANT

SINCE Bishop Kirk's death I have tried to make for myself a picture of his work as a whole and an assessment of its significance in the field of Moral Theology. This paper is merely an interim report of that endeavour.

I confess that while I knew his writings individually before, it was not until he died that it struck me how, looked at comprehensively, it has been a striking and remarkable achievement. I realized two things with something of the sense of discovery. The first is that since the writings of the Caroline divines and Richard Baxter there had been no serious Anglican writing seeking to formulate a Moral Theology for the Church of England. Only three books had made any mark in the long interval, and these all appeared at the end of the nineteenth century: James Skinner's *Synopsis of Moral and Ascetical Theology* (London 1882); J. J. Elmendorf's *Elements of Moral Theology* based on the *Summa Theologica* of St Thomas Aquinas (New York 1892); and W. W. Webb's *The Cure of Souls* (New York 1892).

All these three works, of which Skinner's is the most important, assumed, as Kirk says in the preface to his first writing on this subject, "a considerable acquaintance with the principles and terminology of moral theology on the part of their readers". It was, he tells us, to remedy this lack that he began his work with *Some Principles of Moral Theology*, published in 1920.

The Tractarians had written nothing on specifically moral questions except as these entered into their concern with ascetic and devotional theology. For these reasons Kirk may be regarded as in our time something of a pioneer.

The second consideration is fairly obvious. His successors, few as they are, derive their interest and stimulus from him: Dr Mortimer, Dr McAdoo, and Thomas Wood, the last two picking up Kirk's use of Sanderson, Jeremy Taylor, John Sharp, and other seventeenth-century moralists in his *Problems of Conscience*.

Impressed by these two facts I have been interested to find out what first aroused his concern in this matter and set him working along this track. I have not been very successful, but I find two experiences of his decisive, though the link between them is not yet clear. In the first place there seems little doubt that Kenneth Kirk was led to pursue Moral Theology, and afterwards to specialize in its study, as the result of his life and work as a Chaplain to the Forces in the first World War. He published in 1918 a small book now long out of print and hardly known, called *A Study of Silent Minds*. He was then, I believe, tutor of Keble and secretary of the S.C.M. It was not about moral problems but about the inarticulate mentality of the British soldier, and its subtitle was "War Studies in Education". I find it a very good book and in some ways extraordinarily moving. He displays therein a warm humanity as well as the born teacher's desire to see the admirable qualities of those he was ministering to, more consciously understood by them and intellectually guided. The theme can be stated in four brief paragraphs of his own:

1. The English mind has one great weakness—it is by nature placid, inactive, and, so far as real thought goes, unenterprising.
2. Yet it is capable, under the right stimulus, of high developments of idealism, decision, and devotion.
3. To produce these developments, or, in other words, to guide and inspire the mind to the best forms of self-expression, is the business of education.
4. In going about its business, education will secure the best results by appealing to the one strong point in the English mind—its overwhelming interest in character.

There appears in this book only one issue which shows in germ a specifically ethical interest. He had observed the British soldier's admiration for sacrifice and renunciation for the sake of others—and at the same time a practical philosophy which said, "But a man has got to look after himself". The question how far the good life is a proper balance of self-seeking and self-sacrifice is one which lay at the back of his mind throughout. He returned to it in 1933 in two chapters entitled "Conscientiousness" and "Religion" in the one book of his which was on Ethics rather than Moral Theology proper, namely *The Threshold of Ethics*. He was constantly aware that a bare doctrine of self-sacrifice as an ultimate principle of ethics was not Christian, for it turned people into "moral hypochondriacs"

who measured their duty and love by the amount of self-misery they caused. What then is the place and meaning of self-renunciation in the Christian life, and is it contrary of self-development or saving one's soul? His repeated effort to clear up ambiguities in the use of the adjectives "interested" and "disinterested" must owe something—though it does not poke itself out—to the fact that he who took a first in Greats in 1908 will surely have read Bishop Butler on *Self-Love* and *Benevolence*.

There are in this very first book of Kirk's, too, signs of his knowledge of English literature and his ability at every stage to illustrate moral issues from the situations of people in novels, drama, and poetry.

There can be little doubt that it was as Kirk tackled his own difficulties in offering pastoral guidance to men in the Forces that his main interests were directed to Moral Theology and its problems. He was put on to lecture on these subjects to Chaplains' training schools at Ripon and Catterick Camps in Yorkshire, and his first book on this theme, *Some Principles of Moral Theology* (1920), grew out of that series of lectures, given under the guidance of the Venerable H. Armstrong Hall, Archdeacon of Richmond, Yorkshire, and Deputy Assistant Chaplain General of the Northern Command.

Besides his army experience there was a second factor in his early days which pressed him along the same path. Questions of Moral Theology, Ascetic Theology, and pastoral guidance of souls were very much in the air in the early post-first-war years, and Kirk was a member of a group which used to meet at Cuddesdon to discuss these things. Besides Kirk, the group included Streeter, S. F. Hawkes, Principal Seaton, C. J. Shebbeare, and John Rawlinson; it also embraced J. A. Hadfield, a doctor who was one of the pioneers in using psycho-analytic technique to cure shell-shock in the army. Kirk began then an interest in the relation between the work of the physician and the priest, the analyst and the confessor. He raised the matter in the Preface to *Some Principles*, and he took up the question of the will and the deterministic assumptions of psycho-therapy, in a chapter, "Psychology", of *The Threshold of Ethics*, a criticism of Hadfield's *Psychology and Morals*. The group discussed such questions as the Roman distinction between precepts and counsels; the Roman treatment of the Doubtful Conscience; the definition of Moral Theology; the Anglican practice of leaving much to the individual conscience; the question of vows and promises.

What about the Roman distinction between confession and direction? How far can and ought Anglicans to keep them apart; and have they not run into error by confusing them?

It is not difficult to trace the influence of these discussions in Kirk's various writings. It seems to me that as he worked further at the subject, he deliberately tried to adopt sufficient of the Roman moral tradition to earn the respect of the Roman moralists and to commend his work to the Catholic-minded clergy of the Church of England, and at the same time to restate the tradition in a way more acceptable to the broader and liberalist tradition supposed to be characteristic of Anglicanism. But he was all along bothered about the relation of authority and liberty, and I think never quite to his own satisfaction stated an Anglican theory of authority—as indeed who else has ever done? One aspect of the question he fully discussed in a book *Ignorance, Faith and Conformity*, which was an attempt to assess the soundness of the doctrine of Invincible Ignorance. This appeared in 1925, five years after *Some Principles of Moral Theology*.

Two years later, in 1927, he published *Conscience and its Problems*, probably his greatest book as a Moral Theologian. Though of all his writings no doubt the Bampton Lectures on *The Vision of God* (1928, pub. 1931) will be accounted his outstanding work, *Conscience and its Problems* marks a change in his approach, for he had by then fully assimilated that particular version of Anglican tradition represented by the Carolines, Sanderson, Jeremy Taylor, and Hall—to which was added that of Richard Baxter.

It is possible in reviewing Kirk's life-work to identify certain dominant themes of interest and some change of emphasis during its course. Behind it all lies a deep pastoral concern and a desire to guide the clergy in sound thinking and in practical equipment for their office as guides, teachers, or confessors. I think also he enjoyed the task of intellectual tidying up where terms have got muddled—with the gift that your friends call clarity of mind and your enemies call hair-splitting.

Some Principles of Moral Theology (1920) is a *mélange* laying out the material of that part of the pastor's task which is concerned with ethical teaching, the growth of the Christian character, life in Christ, the training and healing of the soul, the treatment of sin—with one chapter only on Moral Theology proper, namely the one entitled "Conscience, Law and Casuistry". But here he had already

stated a dictum which might be regarded as surprising. He said "the standing problem of all ethics is the reconciliation of the two apparently opposed principles, which may be called respectively the principles of law and liberty, or of authority and individualism. Particularly is this the case for Christian Ethics." I think later he would have revised this and said this was the standing problem of Christian ethics only. And I would myself suggest that in this statement Kirk was reading into what he called "the standing problem of ethics" what is the perennial worry of the Anglican mind. It is noteworthy that for guidance on this question he went to St Thomas Aquinas, who had recognized the dialectic of law and conscience, and Kirk asserted that the Roman Church had been unfaithful to this Thomist teaching by "lapsing into complete authoritarianism". We also find the statement, which he does not seem to have substantiated, that "The only successors of St. Thomas who can fairly be said to have attempted to carry out his ideal of combining the principle of authority with that of freedom are the little group of Anglican divines of the seventeenth century—Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Sanderson, Hall and their fellows". It is perhaps rash for me, with indifferent knowledge of the Carolines, to suggest that they do not seem to have been very interested in this question, unless we can take as an example of it certain of their warnings for those who staked their all on Continental theology without testing its truth by Scripture and who, in the words of Mathew Scrivener, "take no care or pains to look into the Scriptures, or the Doctrine of the ancient church, but through such men's spectacles".

Kirk was sensitive to this matter of authority and liberty long before he became an Anglican bishop, for which person it must always be a bit of a bogey. To one aspect of it he devoted a whole book: *Ignorance, Faith and Conformity*. "Do the conditions of the Church of England", he asks, "make it legitimate for a member of the body conscientiously to refuse conformity in any matter of weight and still retain his membership with all its rights and privileges?" The argument starts from the one case in which all theologians and moral philosophers have been agreed, that ignorance of the law is no sin. That is the case of what is known as "invincible ignorance". The heathen is not the same as the heretic. But what about the large number of deviations from the rule of the Church in faith and morals which do not constitute formal heresy? This is a peculiar problem of the Church of England where the laity tend

to take the clergy, in moral questions at least, as advisers rather than authorities. How far can a church member go in "conscientious non-conformity" without incurring excommunication? Can such "conscientious non-conformity" be put down to "invincible ignorance"—and if it can, then though it carries no moral censure may it allow its holder to retain active church membership, however far it goes?

These are the questions that concern Kirk in this book. He shows himself aware of certain English characteristics which affect his treatment. One is the English tendency to regard departure from orthodoxy in faith as much less regrettable than violation of the Church's moral standard. Many will hold that some articles of the creed make a shocking demand upon intellectual assent, and that Churchmanship can be retained while rejecting them; but while they may not regard the Church's moral law as binding in every respect, at least they do not on the whole regard it as shocking. And then Kirk brings in for his purpose here the difference between Rome and Anglicanism in the matter of authority and the individual conscience. "The genius of Rome has expressed itself", he writes, "in extending to the utmost the sway of promulgated law, at the expense of custom; the genius of Anglicanism, on the other hand, has taken the course of reducing the domain of law to the barest possible minimum, and leaving all else to the régime of custom." This sentence does look like a piece of episcopal pulpit oratory, but it was penned long before Kirk became a bishop, and by then, I think, he would not have put it like that. However, the general truth it contains allowed him to conclude that "where custom, with all its degrees of uncertainty, rules the day; and where (moreover) only the individual can decide what customs oblige and what do not, divergences due to conscientious nonconformity are bound to recur"—and on the principles of moral theology concerning invincible ignorance, these divergencies need not require excommunication or schism. But where is the line to be drawn? He recognizes that a point must come at which divergence in faith or morals from the promulgated law of the Church and from its customary tenets and observances, at which the objector must incur penalties of exclusion. Kirk concludes that each church must make its own body of canon law and then know how to decide pastorally cases of conscience where a member is conscientiously unable to conform to the law and custom of the Church. A *lame* conclusion

perhaps; but a lameness inevitable so long as any church does not slide out of the tension of law and liberty by denying the validity of one of them.

It is no wonder that Kirk's next piece of writing was a study of *Conscience and its Problems*. Apart from the technical excellence of the book, which seeks to give a scientific backing to the casuistry which everybody practices but not everybody admits, Kirk here brings out two valuable considerations. First, he makes obvious, though not dealing with the matter explicitly, that the problem of conscience *versus* human or ecclesiastical authority is peculiar to Christendom. This is due in the main to the significance attached to the individual person who has a direct relation to God, an individual life in Christ, behind and alongside of his relation to them through his terrestrial community and the visible body of the Church. It is also due, though Kirk does not make much of this, to the fact that by the very nature of the Christian religion as supernaturally rooted and as over-arching ethnic and civic communities which are not assimilated to one another by the religious bond—because, in other words, Christianity is the least identified with one ethnic or cultural or political configuration, the Christian man has had his conscience developed and sharpened by having to find his way about in a world of diverse and sometimes conflicting loyalties. Or, to put it still in another way, because Christianity can never give rise to a totalitarian theocracy (and tolerate one for long) the Christian man has to learn to distinguish the things that belong to God because they are his in the Church, and the things that belong to God in another mode, the powers that be, whether it be Caesar or the theologically recognized secular world with its own civil and cultural loyalties. But this is my own mind running away with itself.

Kenneth Kirk saw that Christianity in practice must by its own nature encounter the problem of conscience, which is there long before Reformation protests and post-Tridentine casuistry. The individual moral judgement may at any time be at variance with the mind of the Church—or the mind of the Church may not be declared unambiguously on a particular issue before the individual member.

The second general effect of *Conscience and its Problems* is to make quite clear that the development of casuistry, for forming a moral judgement upon a particular act, was for all its abuses an

effort to support the conscience and not to over-ride it. Particularly is this the case when the law is doubtful—and to save the faithful from over-scrupulousness and consequent frustration. Here comes in a discussion of the three main answers: *Tutiorism* (the rigorist rule)—*in dubio pars tutior eligenda*: When in doubt adopt the stricter course, or, do not act till all your doubts are resolved; *Probabiliorism*, which gives the benefit of the doubt if divided opinion shows one course more probably right than another; this then may be followed. *Probabilism* allows you to disregard a law if there is one probable opinion in favour of its disuetude or invalidity, provided it is a respected opinion. The old Bishop of Barchester learnt to rely on Archdeacon Grantly as the “one medicine in his pharmacopaea strong enough to touch even the gravest disorder, and for every problem of conscience has the unvarying prescription: ‘The Archdeacon will set you quite right about that; no one has got up all that as well as the Archdeacon.’” This is one of Kirk’s quotations to illustrate the obvious dangers of probabilism. Nevertheless he knows it is the only useful casuistical principle, and especially in the Anglican scene for “in the present ferment of opinion in the Church of England it is as easy to summon up doubts about all except the most absolute principles of conduct as it was for the White Queen to believe half a dozen impossible things before breakfast”. Whenever there is genuine doubt (with some exceptions) only probabilism avoids scrupulosity. Genuine doubt means there is “a real ambiguity in the formulation of the law, the undoubted tolerance by authority of its neglect, the definite exception of its operation of certain categories of cases into which that under consideration may reasonably be held to fall, the emergence of an important fact which obviously never entered into the calculations of those who formulated the law—nothing less than this would appear to constitute a ‘doubt’ in the technical sense.” Probabilism, I would say, is the only theory which would justify the Christian pacifist in refusing to bear arms, and would justify a church in supporting a government which respects that conscientious refusal. It is a probable opinion—and a minority one at that—that the non-resistance texts of the Gospels are meant to regulate the relations of men in a settled community.

Kirk hints at an answer to a question I raised at the beginning—Why was there no developing tradition of Anglican Moral Theology after the seventeenth century? The answer he suggests is that the

Caroline theologians were *probabiliorists* to a man; in their concern to educate the individual conscience on the basis of Scripture and Natural Law they would allow no decision to be conscientiously made—where the application of the law was not obvious—except after a prolonged weighing of pros and contras, which is just the process the doubtful and pernickety conscience should avoid.

Kirk then lays out some questions which arise for some Anglicans, under the heading of doubt. Is the Churchman bound by the Western Church's rules about fasting Communion, confession, clerical celibacy; the problem of birth control (which was left by Lambeth 1930 to individual conscience); betting and gambling? Then there are problems of perplexity—as distinct from doubt, or uncertain conscience. Choice between two alternatives for and against which much can be urged; when may you lie; commercial honesty; general strikes; and so on. It should be quite clear that Kirk's interests were always practical and pastoral however much he enjoyed unravelling a complicated moral point. He was especially bemused by one of the Carolines, whom he calls "the ingenious Dr Barlow" (1672), who by a judicious practical casuistry of his own had achieved in that checkered period successive distinction as Bodley's Librarian, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Provost of Queen's, and finally Bishop of Lincoln (non-resident). Barlow complained that there was a great neglect among Protestants of guidance for consciences. Another character who fascinated Kirk was Jeanie Deans, for he often quotes her: she is the young woman in Walter Scott's *The Heart of Midlothian*. Her sister was in danger of execution for the murder of her illegitimate child; but she was innocent both in fact and in the mind of Jeanie. Jeanie could save her by telling a lie. What was her duty? Kirk—who got this problem from T. H. Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*—suggests that Scott had spoiled the fun of a first-rate moral puzzle by weighing the scales on the side of truthfulness by providing a happy though unexpected end to the whole tragic situation. Had Scott allowed Effie to be executed as the result of Jeanie's truthfulness, the problem he says would have been presented in its true colours. He knows however that such casuistic problems are less than real life, though as an exercise it would have been a useful question for a candidate in moral theology to be asked, "What should Jeanie have done?" and not be told what she did do and how it turned out, or to be asked to write two further alternatives to the

story: in one of which Jeanie told the truth but failed to secure the reprieve; whilst in the other she lied and saved Effie's life. Yet, in such a case, says Kirk, we should be pitting our puny imaginations against Scott's whole genius. I am told by Professor H. H. Price that Kirk used to exercise the minds of his colleagues in the Trinity College Common room with the moral problem of Jeanie Deans.

On the actual meaning of conscience I note a change in Kirk's language. In *Some Principles* the language is often that of the Greats tutor: as when he gives the name of "conscience" to that tendency of human nature which leads both conative and cognitive elements to seek unsparingly for satisfaction in the good, the beautiful, and the true. In the *Threshold of Ethics* it is expressed more theologically, and in his essay on "Moral Theology" in *The Study of Theology*, which was his last piece of major writing, he defines conscience as "the mind of man attempting to reach greater certainty in regard to right actions, moral intentions and virtuous motives, either in general, or with reference to some particular case". "The mind of man making moral judgements"—not a special faculty but a special exercise of the faculty of reason—applying the general ethical truths he accepts to particular cases. The task of conscience is eminently casuistical in the right sense of the word.

Kirk was quite used to being the target of the usual cynical remarks about the evasions of moral theologians and their frequent refusal to give a plain answer to a plain question. Mrs Kirk when she was alive once remarked, *à propos* of his casuistical studies, "Kenneth spends all his time inventing clever reasons for doing with a good conscience what we all know to be wrong". It is perhaps a wifely vocation to deflate any tendency of her husband to over-seriousness. All of those who are in this field have to expect this kind of thing; I had it not long ago at the meeting of a group in Oxford, when our much lamented Leonard Prestige (R.I.P.), meaning to be very nice to me, said, "Of course I never regarded you as a typical moral theologian". But the very next day I was consulted by a parish priest who had to give a decision the same evening to a member of his congregation about "conscientious nonconformist" opinion he had with regard to some of his marriage problems. I was able to send the pastor away free of perplexity, but only because I had familiarized myself with the treatment of problems of conscience under the guidance of Kenneth Kirk and "other typical moral theologians".

I conclude that Kirk's contribution has been immense; in as far as it may seem irrelevant to many Anglicans, that is a measure of our Anglican weakness. Let me put this in terms of a familiar criticism of Moral Theology. That discipline, it is asserted, rests upon the distinction between "counsels of perfection" and "moral precepts" and is concerned only with the latter—a kind of low gear religion for the majority, which is false to the Gospel injunction to seek perfection. Kirk was by no means only a Moral Theologian—as a reading of his Bampton Lectures and Sermons will make obvious. In the *Vision of God* he dealt fully with this search for perfection and produced a tentative version of the doctrine of the two standards, which had become accepted in one form or another since Eusebius of Caesarea. Kirk made them two stages in the Christian life rather than alternatives. So far as I am aware he never turned to revise this rather unsatisfactory solution. The doctrine has been severely handled by many good theologians and Christian writers: Edwin Bevan likened it to "curdling of milk, when instead of it having a uniform consistency throughout, some of its constituents coagulate and leave the rest watery". But there have been voices on the other side. S. von Dobschütz (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*) pointed out that the double standard theory of morality crept into the Church as a reply to the rigorous demand of the Gnostics for universal asceticism; it was a large concession to dualism, but it saved one of the most precious possessions of Christianity: the evangelical conception of morality. Hensley Henson agreed. In a letter reproduced in the latest volume of his letters he wrote: "That Christianity should do its work in the world by slightly touching a large area, and intensely moving a small one, seems to be the testimony of history." Kirk affirmed that the distinction saved Christianity from becoming the religion of an introverted sect.

This question is one which the Anglican Church especially has to deal with, and if the "precepts" and "counsels" way of putting it is not the right one, another kind of terminology must be found. The practice of the Church of England is fairly clear. It proclaims a strict Gospel, and treats the reception of Holy Communion as implying that the recipient professes whole-hearted service. In our pulpits we are generally fairly clear on this point. Yet except in cases of openly and notoriously unchristian life, we leave it to the individual to decide upon his own fitness. Moreover

since we have of late deliberately given a definite status to the non-communicant Churchman, it may be taken as fairly certain that the Anglican mind is set against making the Church of England what some sects have sought to become, a Church exclusively of the converted. We have at any rate admitted in various ways a responsibility for the morality of the unconverted, over and above the primary responsibility of seeking their conversion, and this without entangling ourselves with the doctrine that the Gospel contains counsels as well as precepts. What we have *not* succeeded in producing—what it will some day be incumbent on us to attempt—is a clear statement of the principles involved in our practice. Whoever takes a hand in that will have to start where Kenneth Kirk left off.

UNDERSTANDING AND COMMUNICATION ¹

W. R. MATTHEWS

I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation; I have not concealed thy loving kindness and thy truth from the great congregation. (Psalm 4. 10.)

THE poet in these lines brings together two activities of a mental and spiritual kind. His soul grasps and understands the righteousness and love of God and, so far from keeping this knowledge as a private possession, he eagerly proclaims and communicates it to "the great congregation"—the people of the Lord. The two words, "understanding" and "communication", which sum up the psalmist's idea would serve to describe the purpose of our Society. To promote Christian knowledge implies two distinct, though closely related, activities. It involves the effort to extend, deepen, and clarify our knowledge and insight of the revelation of God in Christ, and it involves too the effort to make this ever more widely available, to impart it to the great congregation. This continuous striving towards understanding and the parallel striving for effective communication are intimately connected, though they can be in practice pursued as distinct activities. One of the prime necessities of effective communication is that we should have a clear idea of what we are trying to communicate, while understanding divorced from the desire to communicate ultimately becomes sterile. When it is the Christian faith that we are trying to understand we may be sure that we have misunderstood it if we are not inspired by a sense of the urgent necessity of making it known to others.

I will not dwell on the importance and the difficulty of these twin enterprises on which our Society is engaged. No observant person can be unaware of the contemporary situation with regard to religion. We have wide-spread interest, such as we have not known for generations, in religion and willingness to discuss it, together

¹ S.P.C.K. Founder's Day Meeting Address, 8 March 1957.

with no less wide-spread perplexity about its meaning and truth. We need perhaps to listen to candid and detached critics in order to be sure that we are facing the position as it really is. One such critic, Peter Black, contributed recently an article to the *Daily Mail* on "Religion on T.V." I do not suppose that he was entirely justified in his criticism; I have no competence to judge; but his reaction to the programmes is interesting. The gist of his complaint was that the discussions and arguments in which the Christian faith was debated, on the whole, never got down to the real causes of indifference or antagonism. In other words, he thought that communication had not been established. He ended with a thrust which should disturb any complacency that lingers in our minds: "It is fatal to pretend that Britain in 1957 is made up of mainly religious people and a few honest doubters. It is made up of a majority of doubters, most of whom are so indifferent about their doubts that they do not trouble even to admit that they have them." I do not subscribe to this sweeping generalization, but it is significant that it is the opinion of an intelligent observer who has given some thought to the question. I believe that, if the question could be put to the whole population of these islands, an overwhelming majority would profess some kind of religious belief, but if they expressed their real mental state they would say that they hoped there was some truth in religion, though they wished that they knew what it was and why it was reasonable to believe it.

We should be mistaken if we supposed that the problems of understanding and communication are peculiar to religion, and we may find some encouragement, and perhaps some help, by noticing that religious understanding and communication are part of a wider problem which affects the whole of our culture. In every sphere of knowledge and civilization we may discern the same phenomenon. In our social, political, and economic life the growing complexity and rapidly changing conditions produce similar results. The theory of politics and economics is in a confused state, and the old rival systems of socialism and individualism no longer stand so clear and coherent as they did. In face of the intricacy of the modern social, political, and economic forces and tendencies they seem too simple to satisfy our needs and, in fact, they are modified and adapted under the pressure of events. We need to understand what is happening in human society and in civilization in order to obtain some control of the development. No one would claim that this under-

standing has been carried beyond the most elementary stage. No less urgent in this sphere is the problem of communication. In our own national life we may see this plainly enough. The statesman, as distinct from the mere politician, has at least some conception of the general outlook for the nation and of the measures which reason would dictate in the circumstances. He may be wrong, but at least, if he is fitted for his job, he has a coherent view based on a wide knowledge of the facts. In a democracy he has to communicate his view and the necessity of his proposed measures to the people at large. There is the rub. It might be possible if they were prepared to think hard about the problems and were capable of doing so, but alas, this is far from being the case. The question of inflation, for example, is obviously of crucial moment to this country at the present time. It is of the highest importance that what is known about the nature, causes, and dangers of inflation should be made clear to the people at large. We all know that, so far, communication here has signally failed. The majority of citizens are not willing to be instructed. They have to be galvanized into political activity at elections by slogans and personal myths which often have only the most slender connection with the real issues. We are sometimes alarmed at the indifference of many to the challenge of religion; surely the indifference of so many to politics, and their unwillingness to think about the problems which have to be solved if our nation is to enjoy security and prosperity, are no less disturbing and surprising.

Of course, the salient example of the difficulty of understanding and communication is furnished by science, and no doubt this is the fundamental instance, because, in a sense, science, with its triumphant method, has been one of the causes of the dilemma in other spheres. I shall be able to touch only lightly on this vast topic and that with the diffidence imposed by ignorance. There seems to be a paradox in the advance of scientific understanding. Beyond question, scientific understanding has enlarged its bounds; new ranges of phenomena have been brought under its sway and there is no limit to its possible progress. But, at the same time, the nature of scientific understanding has become a matter of perplexity. One might put the situation crudely by saying that science is certainly a way of understanding but it is now much less clear than it used to be what it is that science understands. Not so long ago it was taken for granted that science gave us information about the

physical universe and that its results could be pieced together to give us an imperfect but true picture of what objectively existed. In those happy days, one could speak without a qualm of "the scientific view of the universe". It was, in the main, that the material universe was one vast and highly complex mechanism and that, as science advanced, it would show more and more clearly that it was explicable by a few universal laws of matter and motion. We still hear the phrase, "the scientific view of the universe", but it is doubtful if the words have any meaning. The whole conception of law is under examination and the uniformity of nature seems to be open to question. Laws which were taken to be universal turn out to be inapplicable when the scale of observation reaches a certain level of minuteness. The assumption that scientific theory gives us a true picture of what is objectively "out there", apart from the observer, is gravely doubted. We learn from Bertrand Russell and other scientific thinkers that we should think not in terms of "things", of atoms or even electrons, but in terms of "events", and if one insists on asking what science is a knowledge of, or of what the universe consists, the answer is—events; but, so far as I know, no one has yet attempted to define the meaning of the word "event" in this context. As I see it, something very remarkable is happening in our time. Science has begun the long struggle to reach an understanding of itself. It will not be attained in our time.

To say that scientific communication has completely broken down would be absurd. The special sciences, particularly biology and astronomy, have passed on their conclusions most effectively, so that they have become the common property of educated persons. The general conceptions of the universe up to a few years ago were brilliantly popularized by two men of genius, Eddington and Jeans, and by many others, but probably we shall not see their like again. No models can represent the fundamental conceptions of modern physics, and analogies are misleading. We are told that the ultimate mysteries can be expressed only in equations. One might reflect on the probable consequence of the growing remoteness of scientific thought from the common mind, but we must remember one vital success in communication before we draw pessimistic conclusions. The scientific method is very generally understood in its main outline. The process of observation and experiment, of hypothesis and the verification of hypothesis, is neither strange nor unintelligible to the majority of people to-day. Its merits are fully

recognized—so much so that many tacitly assume there can be no truth except that which is established by scientific method. Even more widely appreciated is the spirit of science, if that phrase may be allowed—its respect for facts, its caution in drawing conclusions, its reliance upon the co-operation of many researchers in the search for truth, its austere renunciation of fancy, prejudice, and personal feelings in the common enterprise of scientific understanding—all these represent an ideal which the ordinary man respects, even if he does not seek to emulate it.

The problems of understanding and communication, then, are not confined to religion and theology and, in some respects, they are less intractable in them than they are in politics and science, for, after all, religion is about persons and their experience and appeals to the human individual in his most fundamental and unchanging aspect. It is concerned with love and hate, joy and sorrow, hope and fear, guilt and forgiveness—emotions which are the same in every generation. Our material, too, is not subject to radical change, for it is the unchanging Christ and the faith which we believe was, in some sense, once for all delivered to the saints. Our task of understanding is mainly and, in a wide meaning of the word, interpretation.

It seems to me that there is a certain resemblance between our situation as Christian theologians and believers and that of science at the present time. We, too, are living through a period when much that had come to be accepted is now questioned and the very nature of religion and of theology is being reconsidered. For example, just as the significance of scientific propositions is debated, so the status and relevance of theological statements are under discussion. It would take too long even to enumerate the topics which are centres of controversy and new approach. The beginnings of Christianity, the historical value of the Gospels, the development of Christian doctrine: these are very old matters of debate, but they have come vividly alive in recent years. Perhaps more important, in the long run, are those questions which are relatively new. Much fresh knowledge about human nature has come to us through psychology and it may be also through psychical research. Plainly, this is relevant to religion and may throw light upon the nature of spiritual experience, but it would be dangerous to snatch at superficial suggestions. An immense amount of thought and study will be needed before we can arrive at any definite conclusions. Again, with

regard to the central article of the creed, "I believe in God", we find ourselves in an unusual situation. Unfortunately, the prevailing philosophy of the day gives us no help. It has abandoned the great metaphysical ideas of God, freedom, and immortality, and is inclined to doubt whether statements about God have any intelligible meaning. We are thrown back on ourselves to think out a philosophical basis for our faith. For a long time no single mind has been able to keep abreast of every branch of science; it is almost true now that no single mind can have more than a superficial acquaintance with every branch of theology.

This state of affairs is no cause for alarm. On the contrary, the vigour of the investigations and discussions now going on is a remarkable sign of the vitality of our religion. So far from being daunted by the mass of material and the complexity of the problems, the Christian mind is grappling vigorously with the situation, confident that, in the end, all knowledge will be found to be coherent with the faith of Christ and illuminate the truth revealed in him. But it cannot be denied that, for a time, the confusion and the controversies make our task of communication more difficult. We are often in doubt about the interpretation of what we have to communicate, and it may seem that, on a short view, a man who is devoid of theological learning and innocent of theological questioning is a more effective evangelist than one who knows much and has thought deeply. On a longer view, this is not the case. If the communication of the gospel and of the Christian faith is to remain effective and become a part of the intellectual life of the people, we need to labour at a new Christian synthesis, and those who are engaged upon this difficult enterprise deserve not only our support but our charitable judgement of their occasional lapses from traditional orthodoxy. It really matters, and it will matter more and more, that the Christian faith should be shown to be a reasonable faith, one to which a man can commit himself without damage to his intellectual integrity.

We have heard much lately of the "de-mythologizing" of the gospel. It is not always sufficiently understood that Dr Bultmann's purpose in starting this movement was to aid the communication of the Christian message to people who think scientifically. I do not follow him in his attempt to expunge the mythical, but I believe that his substitute for what he calls myth has an important truth in it. He holds that we must interpret the gospel "existentially", by

which he means that we must relate it to the actual existence of every man as he is here and now and show that sin, redemption, forgiveness, and new life are needs and experiences that all encounter if they will consider deeply what they are and where they stand. Surely here Bultmann has something to teach us. To many of our contemporaries the Christian gospel seems remote—all about what happened in a far-off time or what is happening in a far-off heaven. They do not so much reject it as fail to see its relevance, and it makes no impact on their minds. We have to convince them that the needs which Christ meets are their needs and that the life of Christ is potent here and now.

And that brings me to the last and most obvious remark. We have to communicate ideas, and in that respect our problem resembles that of politics or science. But Christianity, though it involves many and profound ideas, is not primarily a system of ideas. It is a way of life—the Way—the way of life in Christ, and in the last resort the only true effective communication is by the demonstration of the power of the Spirit in personal lives. If that fails, all fails, and no clever manipulation of concepts or persuasive apologetic can take its place; but if that does not fail, we need not fear. The Church has often been most gloriously evangelistic when its theology was in the melting pot. I have known perhaps three men who were singularly powerful in converting sinners and drawing them to Christ. Each one was troubled by perplexities and doubts on questions of doctrine. It may be that the very tension of their minds together with their love of Christ helped them to speak directly to the hearts of others who were perplexed but lacked love. So, too, a church that is honestly struggling with great problems to which it can find no certain solution, but does not abandon love of Christ, may be a better means of communication of the gospel than one that thinks it knows the answers to all the questions.

PRESUPPOSITIONS OF THE TYPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO SCRIPTURE

R. A. MARKUS

THE approach to biblical studies which has come into its own and established itself under the name "typological" in the course of the last twenty years or so is essentially as old as Christianity itself. Though it has often—and not least in our own time—revealed its power and fruitfulness in practice, it has again and again been a theologians' battleground; it can still, here and there, meet with opposition, and many of those who accept it do so feeling ill at ease. Much of this opposition and malaise are to be accounted for by the ambiguity of terms like "typological", "allegorical", "figurative", or "spiritual", as applied to biblical exegesis. There is no agreed or even widely accepted terminology, and my aim in this paper is not to suggest one, but to draw attention to the principles which any acceptable theory of the "senses of Scripture" ought to enshrine in its terminology. The confusion in terminology seems to me to spring from a lack of clarity about principles. To disentangle these from the practice of this kind of exegesis, it will be best to return briefly to the source of the problem to which it was meant, originally, to provide a solution.

The Old Testament had been accepted as "scripture" by the Christian community from the beginning. It contained the record of God's dealings with men, concentrated in the history of his chosen people. From the beginning the apostolic preaching, soon to be crystallized in the New Testament documents and gradually to become canonized as "scripture"—presented the events which it proclaimed as the fulfilment of the promises and prophecies made to Israel. Hope, promise, prophecy, and their fulfilment: this is the basic pattern of the prototype of the apostolic kerygma (cf. Acts 2. 14-39), and its foundations, according to the Gospel witness, had been laid by Jesus himself. And yet, this acceptance of the Old Testament is combined with a certain reserve towards it: the old

Law is impotent to give men peace with God, the prophets' visions are a fragmentary revelation, Abraham's faith was yet in the waiting. With the fulness of the truth being revealed in Jesus Christ the precepts of the Law and the exhortations of the prophets were seen to belong to Israel's preparation and to be superseded now that the time of waiting had come to an end.

In this way the earliest Christian community saw the Old Testament as a whole pointing to the work of redemption accomplished in Jesus Christ. But this "pointing to" also found localized expression in individual incidents and persons, images, and narratives: the redemption wrought by God in Christ was a new Exodus, Christ a second Adam, the Lamb of the sacrifice, and so on. But such parallels given in the New Testament to Old Testament counterparts—their "types" or "figures"—are limited in number. The question which was soon to exercise the minds of Christian writers was what to make of the rest of the Old Testament, where the New has nothing to say about the way in which it has found fulfilment, or has no counterparts to suggest. One way of solving this problem was that of allegorical interpretation, modelled on the practice common among hellenistic writers, for instance in Philo's commentaries on the Old Testament, and Stoic commentaries on Homer. In this kind of "exegesis" the literal sense is whittled away and replaced by a meaning which bears some structural likeness to the pattern of the original text. This was a practice particularly tempting in the face of texts apparently devoid of doctrinal or edifying content, and even more with texts which seemed to imply approval of morally suspect conduct, or otherwise to clash with the exegete's own views. The appeal to a Spirit-given insight which disclosed deeper meanings in Scripture than appeared from the letter was too easy, and failed to provide a criterion to distinguish legitimate "spiritual" exegesis from arbitrary speculation.

Thus, notwithstanding the possibility of using it illuminatingly within an authentically scriptural perspective, as for instance by Origen at his best, this approach was soon to reveal its dangers. In the name of what principle could the Gnostics' treatment of the New Testament be disallowed, once its method was conceded to be a legitimate procedure in interpreting the Old Testament—even though its orthodox application were restrained within the limits of the common faith, so that the Old Testament was to yield

"spiritual" truths which, though hardly contained in it, could well claim to be contained in the New? Once the exegete's hold on the literal sense is loosened and the straightforward narrative or historical sense is allowed to slip into the background, appeal can only be made to something outside the text for a criterion of what it means. It was only a short distance from basically orthodox allegorizing to the Gnostics' relentless assault on the historical meaning of the New Testament narratives and their attempt to incorporate Christ, Jesus, the Saviour as dramatic figures in a cosmic myth.

It was against the threat of this kind of unrestrained allegorizing, which they saw to be striking at the very foundations of a biblical faith, that St Irenaeus, and St Justin before him, undertook a theological examination to lay bare the relations of the Old and New Testaments. The concern to safeguard the historical content of the narratives led, in the end, to a theology of history. In Justin this hardly went beyond what the New Testament had already, explicitly, outlined: that the New Testament was the record of the fulfilment of the prophecies contained in the Old. The theology of history involved in this apologetic defence of Christ's claims is barely discerned by Justin, but fully disengaged by Irenaeus. Both Testaments are—in Irenaeus's anti-gnostic polemic—a record, substantially historical, of God's dealings with men. His purposes are gradually unfolded in history; his provisions and commandments for men are appropriate to each phase of the realization of his plan. "God does nothing except in its due time", Irenaeus insists repeatedly. In leading them out of captivity from Egypt, in giving them his law through Moses, in calling them to repentance and new life through the prophets, God is always preparing his people for the final redemption to be accomplished in Jesus the Messiah and to be shared by the nations in the one Church. The redemptive history is an educative process, a divine *paidagogia*, in which each stage has its due place in God's plan for men.

Irenaeus is, of course, quite ready to see prefigurations of the New in the Old Testament. The place he gives to the parallels Adam—Christ, Eve—Mary, and countless others in his theology, is well known. But in the perspective of a redemption history such as he sees in the Bible, this typology of anticipation and fulfilment is firmly planted in scriptural soil. Later fathers may have been less restrained in their explorations of the Old Testament for hidden

New Testament meanings. Some of Augustine's "interpretations" are no less fanciful than, for instance, the attempt made by the writer of the *Epistle of Barnabas* to see an allusion to baptism in every mention of water in the Old Testament. But never again, after Irenaeus's decisive insistence that what the Bible and the apostolic preaching speak of are not timeless truths hidden in a manifold variety of expression, could the Old Testament be treated as a kind of riddle-book in which the New is already present in disguised form. There may be, time and again, extravagance in the use of the Old Testament to illustrate New Testament teaching, or truths of the faith ultimately derived from scriptural sources; but it is only a half-serious extravagance, the exuberance growing from a firm hold on God's historical revelation and prepared, when challenged, to return to authentic bread-and-butter exegesis. So St Augustine will insist, at the conclusion of one of his most fanciful interpretations of the *Song of Songs*, that though the mental exercise of discovering its spiritual sense may be a pleasant pastime for those who, like Augustine, enjoy this kind of thing, there is nothing to be found in such "obscure" passages of scripture that is not elsewhere to be found set forth clearly in literal terms (*de doct. Christ.* II. 6, 7).

Where then is the line to be drawn between authentic typological (or spiritual) exegesis and such fanciful extravagance? Let us note first that there may be a legitimate place for such a use of scripture, even if it cannot always claim to be exegesis—particularly for homiletic purposes. Much of the Fathers' spiritual exegesis falls under this heading; and often, even if it cannot claim to interpret the Old Testament passages which are, ostensibly, under discussion, it does use these in a genuinely exegetical manner to reveal some aspect of the background which would form part of a literal exegesis of the New Testament.

Typological exegesis, in so far as it is a disciplined, theological activity, is no more than an extension of the established methods of biblical scholarship, and, as such, has always, to some extent at least, formed part of exegetical work on the New Testament. It presupposes scrupulous care and attention to the literal meaning of the text and to its literary and historical background: to whatever is relevant and capable of throwing light on what its writers had in mind in writing it. This involves treating poetic imagery as imagery, metaphor as metaphor: "literal" interpretation is not "literalistic", but seeks to establish the original meaning of the text as intended

by its author. Chief among the things which stand behind the New Testament writers is, of course, the Old Testament, which shaped their whole mental world and literary climate. Though its relevance is pervasive, discretion is required; its omni-presence gives no support for a wholesale search for allusions to particular Old Testament passages or images in every New Testament text. Even without a more than ordinarily painstaking search, the New Testament reveals its detailed dependence on the Old—not simply as a literary influence, but as endowing the events recounted by the New Testament writers with their significance. In clothing the New Testament story in Old Testament imagery and weaving narratives on patterns borrowed from the Old Testament, the writers are presenting the events they describe in terms of their significance in God's plan for the redemption of men. It is, of course, particularly round the figure of Christ that a whole multitude of Old Testament images are clustered: he is the second Adam, the Lamb of God, the Suffering Servant, the eternal High Priest, and so forth. The various and often interweaving patterns which hinge on these images have always been a rich source for discerning further correspondences and relations.¹ As any thorough study in this process of the "rebirth of images" (to borrow the title of such a study, by Dr Farrer, of the Book of Revelation) inevitably demonstrates, it is impossible to lay down limits in advance to the ramifications that allusions to the Old Testament may undergo in the course of tracing their patterns and relations. The great key-correspondences (Exodus—Redemption; Creation—New Creation; Law—Gospel, etc.) which form the accepted background of New Testament thought, often provide a context in which lesser images and incidents can unfold unsuspected content depending on the general pattern into which they fit. What one writer² has called the "homology" of the two Testaments, the overall similarity of pattern in God's activity as recorded in them, tends to multiply possibilities of finding genuine or fanciful parallels.

The only possible criterion for what is "really there" is painstaking study of the text with a view to what allusions it contains. In the search for the "spiritual" sense of the Old Testament there is no substitute for careful scholarship. If, as I am suggesting, the "spiritual" sense of the Old Testament is the meaning which the New Testament writers find in it when looking back on it in the light of the revelation given in Jesus Christ, then the only criterion

of this "spiritual" sense is the literal sense of the New Testament. When we speak of "spiritual" or "typological" exegesis of the Old Testament, the activity we have in mind—unless the imaginative allegorizing of an arbitrary kind be admissible—is a kind of return to the Old Testament having seen it fulfilled in the New, and attending to it precisely as foreshadowing this fulfilment.

It is clear that this activity is something radically different from uncontrolled allegorizing on Old Testament (or Homeric, or whatever it may be) texts. For this latter, there is no criterion given in the text itself of what is allowable as interpretation and what is arbitrary importation. The case is different with the spiritual exegesis of the Old Testament: although it cannot itself provide the criteria of its "spiritual" (or "typological"—the terminology does not matter) senses, these criteria can be discerned in the New Testament. Is this situation different from that of any other possible candidate for allegorical interpretation? Supposing Philo had codified the rules which governed his allegorical interpretations of the Old Testament, or some Alexandrian commentator those governing the interpretation of the Iliad: would the fact that criteria were available, in another work, justify the allegorical interpretation of these works as manifesting a genuine meaning present in them, just as the Christian community believes that the New Testament authorizes certain "spiritual" interpretations of the Old?

The assumption that the documents composing the New and the Old Testaments are related in precisely such a unique way as to authorize this treatment presupposes that it is the one Lord who speaks to his Church in all the scriptures. His lordship over history enables him to shape events, within his providential scheme, so as to foreshadow further events. The persons and events described in the Old Testament narratives are the content of the literal meaning which the human authors of the Old Testament sought to convey; the duality of meaning arises not from any ambiguity of language or from any hints at further hidden meanings intended by them or not, but from the sovereign activity of the God of history disposing these events so as to point forward to further events. It matters little whether we call events which do point forward in this way "types" or "figures" of the things to come, or these latter their "antitypes" or "spiritual meanings"; whatever terminology we adopt, it must safeguard the historical relation of "spiritual" to literal sense: the words must be allowed to mean just what they say and no more,

but the things described by them may be given a further meaning by him in whose hands are the present and future alike. When the writers of the New Testament see the redemptive history completed in Christ and the old dispensation fulfilled in his person—and in so doing they were following the Lord himself—they are displaying their material in a pattern and imagery which exhibits the real significance of the events in terms of the divine plan which they fulfil. If their witness is accepted, the typological interpretation of scripture is a consequence of the theology of history embodied in the relation of the two testaments.

What has so far been said may justify the typological interpretation of the Old Testament, but it cannot account for any proposed “spiritual” interpretation of the New, nor justify the remaining of the three kinds of “spiritual” sense distinguished by medieval writers. As an example—apart from being worked out with greater theological care than most it is typical—let us briefly consider the treatment given by St Thomas Aquinas.³ The first half of his statement may be regarded as a succinct expression of the position I have tried to formulate at length hitherto: “The author of holy Scripture is God, in whose power it is to express meaning not only by words—this men also can do—but also by means of things. Hence, here, as in all fields of knowledge (*scientia*) words have meanings, but here, in addition, the things signified by the words themselves also have a meaning. The first meaning, whereby words signify things, is their literal or historical sense. The meaning whereby the things signified by the words signify further things, is said to be their spiritual sense, which is based upon the literal and presupposes it.” This “spiritual sense” is, however, further divided into three classes. The first of these, called by St Thomas as by the whole medieval tradition the “allegorical”, is the sense which the types or figures of the Old Testament possess in their relation of pointing to their antitypes or realizations in the New. Apart from the misleading and unfortunate term “allegorical” chosen to label it, this sense corresponds exactly with what has here been discussed as the authentic “spiritual” or “figurative” sense.

The “anagogical” sense, to take this next, raises important questions of principle. It is the sense which either “the things accomplished in Christ” or the things pointing to these in the Old Testament possess in so far as they signify “things which are in eternal glory”. This is the point at which the traditional theory⁴

of scriptural senses shows itself most clearly as part of a theology of history. Behind the language about the "significance" of the Old and New Testaments lies a clearly conceived scheme of time-relations in the redemptive history. Cullman has already familiarized us, in his great work *Christ and Time*, with the biblical time-scheme in terms of which alone we can understand why the Old Testament can point not only to its New Testament antitypes, but beyond these, to the final fulfilment in his members of what has already been accomplished in Christ, the head of the body. In the perspective of the Old Testament, history began with the creation and ended with the advent of the Messiah, who was to establish his reign of peace and justice. In the Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection of its Lord, the primitive Christian community saw this end as having arrived. Its own expectation of an imminent end to temporal history as we know it, no less than the Jewish resistance to Christ's messianic claims, arose from an appreciation of the cataclysmic significance of the advent of the promised Messiah: here, in a very literal sense, the end of history had appeared in the midst of history. Slowly the realization grew in the Church that life "in the last times", i.e. until the return of the Lord in glory and the ingathering of his faithful from the ends of the earth to share in his glory, may go on indefinitely. But the delay in the Parousia failed, in the last resort, to shake their faith in Jesus the Messiah. Instead, it accustomed them to a new—Cullman has shown how radically new—scheme of time in history: the *end* had already come, the promise and prophecy had been fulfilled, at the *mid-point* of history. And yet, paradoxically, it was also still to come: the already accomplished fulfilment was still to be shared by Christ's members in his Body, the Church. History was no longer conceived as a straight line from creation to the *eschaton*: henceforth it was to consist, as pictured in our reckoning of time B.C. and A.D., in two lines, one from the creation to the Incarnation, the other from the Incarnation to the Parousia.

It is from this wrench in the biblical time-scheme that the possibility of a two-fold spiritual sense arises. The Old Testament as a whole, and particular passages of it in special ways, foretold, promised, and prefigured the Messiah who was to come "in the last times". What was pointed to had come to pass—God had revealed his ways with men in Christ—and yet, it had still to come; the salvation he brought had still to be clinched and shown forth among

men at his second coming in glory. Hence where the Old Testament points forward to its fulfilment, it has a double reference: it may point either to the Incarnation and its events, or the final consummation of earthly history, or to both. We have already discussed the manner in which it prefigures the events of the New Testament narrative. The New Testament itself, however, is witness that the Old Testament was taken as pointing, beyond the fulfilment already realized, to the *eschaton*.⁵ Jerusalem, the sanctuary of Israel, foreshadows at once Christ and his Body, the Church *in via* and the heavenly Church united to her Lord in glory. This further reference to the *eschaton* is what the medieval tradition knew as the "anagogical" sense; and however limited the scope for "anagogical" interpretation may be, in view of the reserve of the scriptural indications, a place for it had to be safeguarded if the great outlines of the economy of redemption with its time-scheme was to remain at the foundation of all "spiritual" exegesis.

The remaining of the three kinds of "spiritual" sense in the medieval classification, the "moral" or "tropological", need not detain us long. It has rarely been treated with a seriousness on a par with that accorded to the other senses. Its relevance is precisely to the life of the Church *in via*, to the Christian soul and community in so far as they are living and acting in the time between Incarnation and Second Coming. It draws on Scripture to portray a way of life appropriate to Christ's members, who draw their life from him but still wait for the complete sharing in the redemption of which they have been made partakers and of which they already enjoy a foretaste. If, in practice, the "moral sense" is little more than homiletic exploitation of biblical texts for purposes of moral exhortation, it is, nonetheless, a reminder that although the hope of Israel has been fulfilled—this is the Christian's faith—there is still a place for hope in the economy of the Incarnation: for our faith, too, is still in the waiting.

I have tried to show that, from the beginning, the Church has seen the biblical narratives as a record of God's dealings with men, that is to say, as a sacred history. Its approach to understanding its meaning, though often obscured by extravagance, sometimes hesitant about procedure, and at times misled by heresy, has, on the whole, remained part and parcel of its faith in the biblical scheme of history. Our own day has seen a convergence of meticulous New Testament studies and the exploration of patristic typology on

similar preoccupations. But the Old Testament is not only a series of documents in its own right and an indispensable context for the exegesis of New Testament writings; nor is the patristic tradition merely a series of unfounded "searchings of the Scriptures": the typology of anticipation and fulfilment is the basic category of a Christian understanding of history.

¹ A beautiful study of these is made in A. G. Hebert's *The Throne of David*.

² A. G. Hebert, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, pp. 218-19.

³ *Summa theologiae*, Ia pars, Q.I, art.10.

⁴ I am taking Aquinas's statement as a fair, though theologically more than normally precise expression of the medieval position. In calling it traditional, I am also asserting its affinity with the approach—though it hardly reaches the stage of explicit discussion of scriptural senses in their work—elaborated by St Justin and St Irenaeus, cf. *supra*, pp. 4-5. It has been said that "there is no difference of principle between the classification of the senses in which Scripture is to be interpreted as given by Clement of Alexandria (the literal, mystical and prophetic senses), that of Origen (the literal, the moral and the spiritual) and the medieval distinction of the literal, allegorical, moral and anagogical senses . . ." (A. G. Hebert, *The Authority of the Old Testament*, p. 268). This seems to me greatly oversimplified. Both Clement and Origen seem at times to obscure the basic difference, asserted by Aquinas, between the literal and the other senses: viz. the fundamental distinction between a sense which belongs to the words of the text and one which belongs to the dimension of history, to events in a pattern of events. This confusion is also shared by a good deal of medieval discussion; the clear-cut distinction given by Aquinas in the passage quoted above—established after some hesitant attempts—embodies the essence of his contribution to the discussion. The classification of the threefold spiritual sense is secondary, and an attempt to provide for the currently accepted enumerations.

⁵ Cf. in particular, the apocalyptic prophecies in the Gospels, and Revelation.

THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE LORD'S ASCENSION

C. S. MANN, O.S.B.

IT WOULD not be asserting too much to say of much, if not of most, common teaching on the subject of the Lord's Ascension that it was very largely a "theology of destination". We can readily call to mind the hymns popularly esteemed for this festival of the Christian year, the kind of material provided in Sunday School lesson-books, and the imagery which art has used to clothe the significance of the close of the Forty Days—all of it very much bound up with this idea of "destination". So much is this the case, that it would appear that any attempt to examine the theological interests of the New Testament writers in the matter is treated as a sort of rallying-cry, "To the barricades!" in defence of what is assumed to be credal orthodoxy. Once suggest that the annual protest of the late Dean Inge to the daily press at the time of the Ascension festival at all events held the germ of truth against something crudely material, and the supporter of the Dean is very likely to find himself pilloried along with heresiarchs of the calibre of Nestorius. Perhaps the *locus classicus* of the literature concerned to defend what has come to be regarded as the "traditional view" is the conclusion of one chapter of a work written by Mgr Ronald Knox in the days of his Anglican allegiance¹: the burden of Mgr Knox's contention in that particular work was that the earth was by so many pounds avoirdupois weight lighter after the Ascension than it was before. It is particularly to be regretted that the attitude there adopted has come to be regarded in so many minds as synonymous with credal orthodoxy, since, as it is hoped to demonstrate, neither creeds nor Scripture are concerned to combine the understanding of the Ascension with lessons in elementary physics.

Since the matter of credal orthodoxy has been already raised, it will be of some service to our consideration to make some observations here on the Ascension theme in the creeds. The old

Roman Creed and its dependents all have the clause "*et ascendit in caelis*" followed by the clause closely associated with it—"*sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris*". But it should be noted that the Greek of Hippolytus underlying the word *ascendit* is not easily patent of the "elevation-locality" popularized in art and in our hymns—Hippolytus has: *kai anabanta eis tous ouranous kai kathemenon*.² What may lie behind the present form of our creeds has been dealt with in the invaluable work of Canon J. N. D. Kelly,³ but it may here be noted in passing that we appear to owe the "*ascendit*" clause to the *Apology* and the *Dialogue* of Justin Martyr. What Canon Kelly has called the "tempting country" of the Ignatian letters would give no support to the "destination-orthodoxy". Of the Eastern creeds, that of Macarius has no mention of the Ascension, but in the common pattern thought by Lietzmann to underlie all the Eastern creeds, *kai anelthonta eis tous ouranous* certainly has place. At the end of all the process of creed-making, and near to our own time, the so-called "Creed of Pius V" rather surprisingly says nothing of the Ascension and Session beyond what is contained in the Nicene Creed; more surprising is the total omission of all mention of the Ascension in the *Forma Receptionis neo-Converti* provided for the use of the Roman Catholic clergy in England.

Granted the credal antiquity of the "*ascendit*" clause, how is that clause to be understood? Are we required to give assent to a somewhat crudely physical elevation in terms of location in space—and more than that, are we to infer from the record of Scripture that the Ascension was a separate "event"? To say that the Ascension is an "historical fact", after the manner of many books on Christian doctrine, is simply to beg the question—it remains to give some explanation of what we mean by an "historical fact", and Professor Wheeler Robinson was continually reminding us that there are no such things in history as "bare facts". At the same time, to ascribe to the "*ascendit*" clause something of the character of an observed phenomenon in the physical sciences demands that we ascribe the like character to "*sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris*"; and to plead that the one must be interpreted literally and the other symbolically is to be frivolous. We have, however, received a tradition of sequence, both in creeds and in liturgy, and the sequence of Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Session is one which has entered fully into the Christian imagination. How far creed has influenced liturgy, and liturgy creed, with consequent results in calendar, is

not matter for investigation here, but the probable mutual influences would be extensive in the early centuries. We have now to turn to the New Testament evidence, leaving for later consideration the passage in Acts 1. 1-12.

Acts has two passages which could conceivably be construed as bearing on our inquiry: 2. 32, 33 and 5. 30, 31. Of these two, the former could be made to carry a time-sequence of two events, Resurrection and Ascension, but the sense of the Greek binds Resurrection—Exaltation into one whole, and there is no suggestion here (other than anything which a “conditioned” imagination would read into it) that there was between the Resurrection and the Exaltation any “event” which might be named “Ascension”. In the reference in Acts 5, the Exaltation is predicated of the Risen Lord, and there is no evidence of the event-sequence supposedly to be inferred from the creeds. In the Pauline corpus, among the letters held to be undisputedly from the Apostle, there are very few references to our subject. Rom. 8. 34 asserts that Jesus died, is risen again, is at the right hand of God, and makes intercession for us—and here the dependence of Exaltation on Resurrection is very marked, and there is no “intervening” stage. This is even more marked in Col. 3. 1, where the exalted life of Christ, which the Christian initiate is to seek, follows as a consequence of the Resurrection. It is convenient here to take note of Eph. 1. 19, 20—since the dependence of that work on Colossians has been the subject of much recent inquiry. And here we find the same emphasis which has been so far noted in Romans and Colossians—that the present Exaltation of the Lord is a direct consequence of, and dependent upon, the Resurrection, without any intervening stage, process, or event. In Phil. 2. 8, 9, there is the contrast drawn between the Incarnate humility and the present Exaltation of the Lord; and very markedly here is the connection made between the obedient death and the consequent glory—a feature which we shall have occasion to notice later in the inquiry. The only other reference which bears on our subject in the Pauline corpus comes in 1 Timothy, at 3. 16. It is attractive to think there is to be found here a “credal” statement, but though in present form, and with our presuppositions drawn from centuries of credal recitation, the verse may be read as a credal formula, it has no mention of the saving death, still less of the Resurrection. It does assert that the Lord has been received up into glory, but there is no obvious and

clear statement of any precedent humiliation before the present glory—certainly there is no clear-cut time-and-event sequence familiar to us from the creeds. There is a reference to the Lord's entering into heavenly glory in 1 Pet. 3. 22, closely linked as have been all the passages so far reviewed with the Resurrection—but this passage gives us no help in our search for the familiar event-sequence of the creeds.

At first glance, it might be thought that the Epistle to the Hebrews, with its strong emphasis on the heavenly intercession and priesthood of the Lord, would on that account furnish us with some definite lines of approach to the problem. This is far from being the case. The Epistle has indeed a very prominent theme of the Exaltation of the Risen Lord, but on examination can offer us little, if anything at all, by way of elucidating the paramount question: "Was there a separate event forty days after the Resurrection by which the witnesses were assured that the Lord had entered upon the glory of the Father?" It is true that Jesus is spoken of as having "entered" (*eiselthen*) in 6.20, and similarly in 9. 12, 24—but here we must reckon with the author's theological consideration that the Death and the Entrance are viewed as two stages in the True Sacrifice, in contradistinction to the Levitical sacrifices. By the same token, the Lord is described as having "sat down" in the heavenlies. But there is no light whatever on the problem of history or of sequence of events. In fact, there is but one explicit reference to the Resurrection in Hebrews—at 13. 20—and this fact alone would make us pause before assuming that in Hebrews there was likely to be found any help in our inquiry; but the author himself makes it clear that he is not concerned to lay again any foundation of elementary truths assumed to be common ground between him and his readers (Heb. 6. 1-3).

It would appear that there is no evidence to be drawn from the New Testament, outside the Gospels and Acts, of any direct sequence of events—Resurrection and then Ascension. What does emerge from the evidence is the emphatic assertion that the Person known, heard, and seen, in the days of his Incarnate life, is now "in glory" at the right hand of the Father. The precise vocabulary may differ from one author to another, but the differences of vocabulary and expression are in any event slight, and are not in themselves so impressive as is the unanimity of the declared conviction of the present "glory" of the crucified Lord. Consideration of this

unanimity, which, it will be suggested, is of supreme importance, must for the moment be postponed and our attention turned to the Gospels.

In St Mark, the emphatic *ego eimi* of Messiahship in 14. 62, is followed by the declaration of the coming glorification of the Son of Man, and in the context we are probably justified in seeing that glorification as contingent upon, and issuing from, the coming Passion and Death. In that event, the repetition of the verb *opsesthe* at 16. 7 would appear to link the glory of Messiah with one indivisible complex of Passion, Death, and Resurrection. Whatever may be the origin of the ending of Mark's Gospel, it would seem altogether to go beyond the testimony of language to suggest that at 16. 19, 20 we have anything which would justify us beyond doubt in claiming that there is here a reference to an Ascension-event. It may, indeed, be no more than a rounding off of the Incarnation-narrative, an assertion that after the familiar converse with him in the days of his flesh, men would henceforth know him in that fashion no more. But we have to note once more the assertion that the completion of the earthly ministry is but a stage in the glory which is the Son's at "the right hand" of the Father. There are no indications of a time-sequence of Resurrection—Ascension in St Matthew, and the last five verses of the Gospel are essentially a narrative of a revelation of Exaltation-glory. Even in Luke 24. 52—omitted by some versions, though not by the majority—there is no ground, on the strictest basis of language, to suppose that men saw Jesus leave earth and enter heaven. Unquestionably, St Luke leaves the matter of the Ascension, however understood, for fuller and more precise treatment in his next work, and it will be fair to him to defer considering his own view until we do so in the Acts.

Bearing in mind the oft-repeated insistence of the New Testament on the present "glory" of the Risen Lord, we turn to the Fourth Gospel—so often the theological interpreter of the narrative of the Synoptists. And in the Fourth Gospel, we find at once the most trenchant and exhaustive treatment of the whole understanding of the "glory" of the Son of Man; and not only so, there are very clear indications of what we ought to think of the credal sequence of Passion, Death, Resurrection, Exaltation—coupled with very suggestive illumination of our liturgical sequence of Good Friday, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost. First as to the language employed

in St John. At first sight, there would appear to be explicit reference to the Ascension as an event at 6. 62, and another at 20. 17, where the same verb is used. But it would be unwise to pin too much on these two texts—there is constant reference all through the Fourth Gospel to the Lord “coming” and “going”, with a meaning all through that the work of grace which the Son pursues here in the Incarnate life is to be understood as a “coming from” the Father, to “return to” the Father on the fulfilment of that work. It is to be noticed that in the discourses at the end of the Gospel this theme of “coming” and “going” has a very marked prominence—and all with immediate reference to the approaching Passion. As Lightfoot observes⁴: “The Son of man is to return, by the ascent of the cross, to the Father. At present the Spirit has descended and abides on Him alone (1. 33); but after his return to the Father those who, remaining in the world (17. 11) and eating His flesh and His blood, share in His life and death, will, as a result of His completed work, also be partakers of the Spirit, and so will have life.” The same commentary draws our attention to the essential meaning of the Resurrection-appearance to Mary Magdalene, and the possible reference to an Ascension in 20. 17; here Lightfoot observes that there “is a sense . . . in which it (the return to the Father) can truly be said to have occurred at the moment and as the result of His death . . .”. We hope to show that it is possible to be even more definite on this point. Almost everywhere in the Fourth Gospel where the verb “glorify” (*doxazein*) is used, it is used with reference to the approaching Passion and Death. This is a familiar enough thought, and there is no need to detail the evidence. But even in cases where there is no *prima facie* direct reference to the Passion, it can be shown that the thought of Passion—Exaltation is not far from the mind of the Evangelist. In 11. 4, the sickness and death of Lazarus is directly bound up with the “glorifying” of the Son of Man—and the Evangelist is at pains to remind us that it was the raising of Lazarus which led directly to the saving Death. And the Spirit who “glorifies” the Son in 16. 14 is the Spirit who is given when Jesus is glorified, 7. 39. Another Johannine word, *hupsoun*, would appear to give additional weight to this evidence. The word is used invariably in LXX as a translation of *nasa’* and *rum*, wherever in the Psalter the “elevation” or enthronement of either the king, the Anointed One, or Yahweh himself is under consideration. In the Fourth Gospel, the context demands in every case not only the physical lifting-up from

the earth of the Saviour on the Cross, but also carries the sense of lifting-up to exaltation and glory. Nor is this sense in any way diminished by 8. 28, where the lifting-up is declared to be the work of his hearers, for the Lord was at his death on the Cross in the hands of those who sought his life, and they were not only the instruments of his crucifixion, they were at the same time the unwitting agents in the supreme act of "glorification".

If in the Fourth Gospel all the evidence points one way—that the Exaltation-glory of the Son was accomplished by the single complex Passion—Death, sealed in Resurrection, what is to be made of the one passage in the Gospel where the Ascension might be held to lie in the future—in 20. 17? The charge to Mary Magdalene must be seen in the light of 20. 27, where there is an express command to Thomas to touch the Lord, an action previously forbidden to Mary. The explanation can only be, as Lightfoot⁵ points out, that the resumption of the Son's glory at the Father's side is held to have taken place (if indeed that grammatical usage can be held to be legitimate here) in the week between Mary's recognition and the appearance in the Upper Room a week later. "Hence, a week later, that which was forbidden to Mary can be allowed to St. Thomas. St. John, it seems, thus teaches the reader that since the Lord, clothed with our human nature, has now resumed his rightful place of glory (17. 5, 24) at the Father's side, and immediacy of contact with Him becomes possible for disciples and believers, a contact no longer dependent, as in the days of the ministry, on external companionship or physical proximity."⁶ If, in our human dependence on categories of time and space, we are continually asking the question "When?" and "How?" in relation to the events of the Salvation-history presented to us in the Gospels—questions more properly suited to that old dream of constructing a biography of the Lord—the author of the Fourth Gospel will allow us no escape into the realms of our conceptions of "history". Convinced as we are of the essential "rightness" of the Lucan scheme of Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Bestowal of the Spirit, the Evangelist has yet another significant "theologoumenon" for our examination. At the close of the Passion, he tells us that Jesus *paredoke to pneuma*. Now this may mean merely, as our English versions have it, "and gave up his spirit" (RV) or "and gave up the ghost" (AV); but this will hardly do justice to the form *to pneuma* and it does less than justice to the verb. Both *paradosis* and

paradidomi wherever used elsewhere in the New Testament essentially carry the meaning of something to be "handed on" or "bestowed". Not only so, but we have to bear in mind the two assertions in the Fourth Gospel that the Spirit was to be given when Jesus was glorified (7. 39), which to the author means the Passion—Exaltation, and the quite explicit "delivery" of the Spirit on the evening of the Resurrection (20. 19 ff.). We can only suppose, with our presuppositions, that for the author, the Ascension has already happened—and this in spite of that which the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns was accustomed to call the "pressure of the *sarx*" in St John in the remainder of the narrative. If the evangelist is clear about the quite new, non-tangible, non-spatial, conditions of the Lord's Risen Presence, it seems that he is equally clear that there is a single Exaltation-theme of Passion, Resurrection, Glorification, Gift of the Spirit, "regarded as drawn together into one, each of the . . . features therein including and requiring all the others . . ." ⁷

On this showing, what becomes of the familiar Lucan pattern, the pattern which has shaped all our liturgical practice, and incidentally all our common thinking on this matter? Of the language used in the New Testament, the Greek words employed will give us no help in determining whether or not there was an "event" which can be called an "Ascension". Of all the words employed the most significant is perhaps *hupsoun*—but even here, it would be necessary to give the same significance to that verb not only in the Epistle of James (4. 10), but in other contexts in the Gospels (Luke 1. 52, Matt. 11. 23) and by no means least to the passages in the Psalter where the same verb is used of the exaltation of the Davidic king. But this said, and bearing in mind the theological interpretation of the Passion-Exaltation narrative offered to us in the Fourth Gospel, we may be able to find more in the Lucan narrative than a mere sequence of events. While it could be pleaded that what is given to us in Acts 1 is yet another example of that divine condescension which deals with us through sacramentals (cf. John 6), and which would therefore not stand alone in the New Testament, it has to be said very definitely that the narrative, strictly read, does not say that men saw the Risen Lord either leave the earth or enter heaven in terms of time-space categories. Indeed, read in the light of the Johannine "theologizing", the Greek present participle could be made to read: "They went on looking up (i.e. not quite knowing where to look), while all the time he was being removed from

them." Fortunately for our purposes, two recent articles⁸ have gone very far to dealing with the difficulties of the Lucan narrative for us.

In the first, Dr J. G. Davies⁹ has convincingly shown that there is a very close parallel between the Transfiguration account in Luke (Luke 9. 1-34) and the Ascension narrative in Acts (Acts 1. 1-12). The parallel is far too close to admit of mere accidents of usage. The reader is referred to the relevant article for a detailed examination of the order and the vocabulary in the Luke-Acts accounts. But why did St Luke write up his account of the Ascension in a manner unmistakably paralleled in the Transfiguration account? Dr Davies suggests: "At the Transfiguration Jesus enters into the cloud which is both the veil and the vehicle of the divine glory; this is the prefiguration of the glory which lies in the future; the presence is withdrawn and Jesus is found alone. At the Ascension Jesus enters into the cloud and remains within the presence and at this moment of his exaltation he is glorified with that glory which will become visible at his return." If we have any quarrel with this interpretation of the matter, it must be only that it does not remove our difficulty of deciding, in the face of the Johannine evidence, whether there was, or was not, in our sense, an "event" which we customarily call the "Ascension". At the risk of being unfair to the author of the article, Dr Davies does appear to hold that there was. But if so, what is to be said of the fact that the other Gospels appear to have no such view—and that the remainder of the New Testament is either completely negative, or at best wholly indecisive? Another article in the same periodical¹⁰ has very interestingly traced what the writer holds to be evidence of two originally distinct Christologies in the Acts, conveniently to be summarized under the two titles "Lord" and "Christ": the first, and less developed, which declared that the Messianic age had yet to be, that though there was no need to speculate on the identity of Messiah—since Jesus had appeared as Forerunner of the Christ he is to be—yet Messiah has yet to appear; the second, developed, and Lukan Christology, which was to become the "orthodoxy" of the Church—that incredible as it might appear, Cross and Passion were the Messianic Act, and that together they were the eschatological Event of which in the days of his flesh the Lord had spoken. In this later, developed, Christology, it was beyond all dispute that Jesus was the Coming One, was his own Forerunner in a very definite sense, was Messiah, and declared to be such, with power, by the Resurrection from the dead. There

was no need to look further, no need to be looking up into the heavens, no need to "expect another". If Dr Robinson's contention be correct—and the author trenchantly claims that had we no such Christology as that delineated in Acts 3, it would have been necessary to invent or suppose it—then all the light we need is shed on the narrative of the Ascension in Acts 1. 1-12. The narrative, we have to suppose, is a triumphant assertion of the author's own understanding of Christology (and incidentally that of the Fourth Gospel)—that there was one complete Messianic Act, summed up in Passion and Resurrection, vindicated by the Father, sealed for all time. But that there were living at the time of the writing of Acts those who had entered the Church through the movement of John, and for whom Messiah was still "The Coming One", seems to be the best possible explanation of a deliberate "writing-up" of an Ascension narrative at so decisive a point in the very forefront of the second volume of the Lukan work. Lord and Christ, pre-existent Lord, incarnate in the terms of earthly experience, dying, rising, declared to be Messiah—this is the Lukan message.

If then, what we have in the Gospels is a Resurrection appearance of Exaltation-glory, and not a mere assumption;¹¹ if, as in the Johannine understanding of things, we are to see the whole complex of Passion, Death, Resurrection, Exaltation, Bestowal of the Spirit, as one stupendous Messianic Act of Deliverance, what ought to be our attitude to the liturgical sequence we have inherited? And what ought to be done, if anything, with that very sequence itself?

In answering those questions, one consideration ought to be examined briefly first. It is: "Did the authors of the Gospels and Acts believe that the Ascension happened?" Without in any way paying whole-hearted homage to the Bultmann school, it nevertheless ought to be recognized far more often than is commonly the case how very new is the discipline of what we understand by "history"—and to demand from the first theologians the same kind of *sense* of history as that of G. M. Trevelyan is to demand something of which they would have been almost entirely unaware. Dr Lowther Clarke long ago drew attention to the difficulties inherent in our common understanding of the second chapter of Matthew, and it is hoped that enough has been done here to demonstrate the difficulties of our usual understanding of the Ascension tradition. We ought to be far more alive to what has happily been called

"salvation-history", and all that it may imply for our understanding of the Gospel narrative. If the work of Dr Farrer has demanded that we do not underrate the methods of the evangelists, and if the work of Dr Thornton compels us to look beneath the surface of mere narrative—still more if the work of Père Daniélou bids us take very seriously the Old Testament allusions in the New—then we ought not to be surprised if the author of Acts demands that we take equally seriously the supreme urgency of his Christological claims, seen in the light of his own understanding of "salvation-history". Had our New Testament writers, therefore, been asked the question, "Did the Ascension happen?", it is at least possible that they would have been puzzled by our use of terms, but *granted our use of terms*, the answer would have been a very triumphant affirmative—and an affirmative used with an urgency which in so many ways eludes us altogether. We may ourselves be somewhat concerned to know whether in fact there was an event of the character outlined in the first chapter of Acts—the kind of event at which "Our Special Correspondent" might have been present and have given an account for his readers, or whether on the other hand, as the Fourth Gospel might be held to indicate, there was a series of Resurrection-appearances which came to an end with an abruptness which left the apostolic witnesses for a time bewildered and uncertain. If the New Testament, apart from the Acts and the Fourth Gospel, appears to be uninterested in our particular problem, or at all events cannot shed any light on the matter, what is to be said of the relative standing of the two documentary exceptions? With the Fourth Gospel, we are notoriously faced with an Evangelist who at one time will display an avid interest in matters of detail in history and topography alike, and at other times is perfectly prepared to amend or alter drastically the Synoptic Gospels in the interests of his own theological concerns. St John is insistent at one time that the Resurrection-body of the Lord is tangible, but equally clear that it was in no way whatever subject to the laws of mere physical existence. There is about the third Appearance in St John an air of the tremendous force of the drama that had been worked out before their eyes, and was still being worked out—but it is all part of the Exaltation-glory theme of Passion—Resurrection, and we are left strangely unsatisfied with the ending of it all. Indeed, we are unsatisfied even because of the assurance of the Evangelist himself that there were indeed many other signs, unrecorded, but these *are*

written that we may believe. More and more, as we make the Fourth Gospel our own are we forced back to the point of view of the author himself—that there was in human affairs an irruption of the Divine Word, an irruption which with inexorable force compelled upon our attention in one single Redemption-act all that we are accustomed, both in Liturgy and in common thinking, to regard under the regulated sequence of Passion, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, Coming of the Spirit. Whatever may be the truth of the possible two strands of Christology in Acts, there can be no room for any such confusion in the Fourth Gospel, where the Man Christ Jesus is explicitly Messiah from the very outset, and where *Dominus regnavit* is not a specifically “Ascension-theme” but part and parcel of the whole Incarnate life. What, then, of Acts? Luke claims to have traced all things accurately from the beginning, and in his second volume makes the claim that his new work is but a continuation of the first. Nevertheless, the parallels between Luke 9. 1-34 and Acts 1. 1-12, to which attention has been called by an article of Dr J. G. Davies (see above) do raise the question as to how far the writer of Acts was consciously using a “pattern”. For in both passages in question there are not merely verbal parallels, but parallels of essential ideas: the commissioning of the apostles comes in both, as also references to John Baptist, the kingdom of God, the due presence of “witnesses”, a cloud comes in both narratives, in both there are “two men”, in both there are references to the Death and the Resurrection, and in both there is a future Parousia spoken of. Other similarities (a mountain, shining garments, looking up to heaven) there are, and the whole picture may well cause us to suspend final judgement on the historicity of the Ascension narrative in Acts—or at any rate suspend judgement as to whether we have there an account of something which would answer to our own very natural demands for a “sign”. And Luke the historian appears to be quite capable of massing together his material to a pattern of the book Deuteronomy, as a recent work has been concerned to demonstrate.¹² Plainly, the parallel between Luke 9. 1-34 and Acts 1. 1-12 is the theological parallel—the manifestation of “glory”. Here, the author of Acts, the Synoptists, and St John are all at one; there was in the days of the flesh-taking of the Word a manifestation of “glory”, that pre-existent glory which he had with the Father, which never, even in the moment of his

deepest humiliation, ceased to be his, and upon which he re-entered in Passion and Resurrection.

The Ascension, then, "happened"; but in what terms it did so come to pass we are probably in no position to say. There is nothing in the least improbable in the assertion that it may have happened in the fashion described in Acts, for the Lord commonly used sacramental signs all through his ministry, and even after his Resurrection. That the Johannine version of things would have us attempt to grasp one single cataclysmic theological concept, a once-for-all consummation of the work of salvation in one supreme Event, in no way *necessarily* invalidates the historicity of the Acts account of the matter, for that kind of conception would be all of a piece with Johannine writing. It is also at least possible, bearing in mind the evidence of the rest of the New Testament, that St Luke deliberately paralleled a Resurrection-Appearance (the last?) with the narrative of the Transfiguration in order to drive home his Christological lessons.

Our understanding of the matter is on another level. We have down the centuries inherited a liturgical sequence of Passiontide, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost. With that sequence we are content. Certainly we can see how intolerable a burden would be a liturgical commemoration of one single all-embracing Messianic Act such as we find in the Fourth Gospel. The sheer theological impact of the Johannine interpretation is such that when seen in its entirety and simplicity it becomes an almost unmanageable burden to our minds. Indeed, had we not the sequence of things as they are set out for us in Acts, it would have been of compelling necessity to invent some such sequence. If understanding of the tremendous theological import of the Fourth Gospel, seen in the light of Acts, is one thing, yet another is the understanding we bring to bear on the actual liturgical sequence we have inherited. There would indeed be very good grounds for a drastic revision, if not expulsion, of many of the hymns we commonly use in the Great Forty Days and in the period after the Ascension festival. But it is not intended here to fan the flames of that kind of controversy!

If the examination of the office hymns, antiphons (one of which survives in our Common Prayer as the collect for the Sunday after the Ascension), and psalmody for the feast of the Ascension will give us small support for a kind of "destination-event" understanding of the Lord's Glorification, there is in that material much which

one finds to be so often lacking in popular (and not-so-popular) homiletics—the supreme emphasis on the Lordship and Dominion of Christ.

The primitive Church was far from feeling any sense of tragedy in the events of Passiontide and Easter, still less was there any of that sense after the Exaltation of the Lord; the idea of the Church as an “orphaned fold” would have been quite foreign to St Paul—and it ought to be quite foreign to us.

Dominus regnavit! That is the message alike of Acts and the Fourth Gospel, the message of the Gospel, and the timeless, triumphant proclamation of the Church. The Lamb slain is the Rider on the White Horse, and he who was condemned to die is he who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. What we need to recapture is the urgency of the apostolic proclamation of the Lordship. Rightly understood, the feast of the Ascension will compel us to take hold of that urgency.

¹ R. A. Knox, *Some Loose Stones*, 1913, p. 222, Note on the Risen Body of our Saviour.

² G. Dix, *Apostolic Tradition*, S.P.C.K. (for C.H.S.), 1937, p. lix.

³ J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, Longmans, 1950.

⁴ R. H. Lightfoot, *S. John's Gospel, A Commentary*, Clarendon Press, 1950, p. 163.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 331.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

⁸ J. G. Davies, “The Prefiguration of the Ascension in the Third Gospel”, *J.T.S.*, vi.2 (New Series); J. A. T. Robinson, “The Most Primitive Christology?”, *J.T.S.*, vii.1 (New Series).

⁹ J. G. Davies, *op. cit.*

¹⁰ J. A. T. Robinson, *op. cit.*

¹¹ This sentence was passed on to me as a quotation from the present Archbishop of York; but having been unable to trace its origin it is left unacknowledged.

¹² C. F. Evans, “The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel”, in *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Blackwell, 1955.

HENRY PARRY LIDDON: "THE DIADOCHUS OF THE TRACTARIANS"

E. D. MACKERNESS

MODERN Anglicans who do not subscribe to Anglo-Catholic principles might well, in the last analysis, be disposed to regard J. H. Newman as "an Evangelical gone to the bad". And yet, in spite of the sense of betrayal consequent upon Newman's decision to embrace the Roman faith, the Church of England was in some respects strengthened by the defection of those who felt and thought as he did. For now that the uncompromising extremists were declaring themselves, the more moderate adherents to Tractarian principles could safely broaden the basis of their activities. In the case of Henry Parry Liddon this process takes several different and interesting forms.

When Liddon went up to Christ Church in 1846 the "Oxford Movement" had become much more of an "extra-mural" affair than it had been during the days of the Tractarian revolt. In the University itself, party strife continued unabated, with the result that Churchmen tended to group themselves into factions associated with particular colleges, each standing for certain divergences of policy or opinion. At Christ Church, obviously, Liddon could not help coming under the influence of Dr Pusey; though his biographer takes care to emphasize that, unlike Gerard Manley Hopkins, Liddon never experienced the slightest doubt that his primary allegiance was to a specifically English mother church. Nevertheless, in a sense that would at one time have been acceptable to Newman himself, Liddon's interest in Christianity was essentially a Catholic one. To this extent his political and social thinking—as it shows itself in his sermons, on which the following notes are based—is tinged with "conservatism". And yet there is a certain liberality about his views on the condition of man which gives him a somewhat paradoxical position in the ecclesiastical life of his time.

Liddon's contemporary reputation was almost as distinguished as that of Keble or Newman. Those who heard his preaching passed highly favourable judgements on his matter and style; and tributes to his eminence can be found in countless journals from London and the provinces. Yet there is one account of Liddon which is somewhat

at variance with most of the others. This is to be found in Mrs Humphrey Ward's *A Writer's Recollection* (1918). Mrs Ward saw a good deal of Liddon when living at Oxford. Her husband, T. H. Ward, was a Fellow of Brasenose, and was associated with a group of "liberal" intellectuals—mostly Balliol men—which included Arnold Toynbee, T. H. Green, and Benjamin Jowett. This eminent band of "progressive" thinkers, as is well known, made no secret of the fact that they were just as interested in the "condition of the people" question as in the state of modern theology. And the significance of this pre-occupation with human "usefulness", social reform, and the enrichment of life for the populace is only to be appreciated, Mrs Ward claims, when we compare their work with the activities of a rival group—the Christ Church theologians, of whom Liddon and Pusey were the most prominent members. Nobody, Mrs Ward admits, could doubt the personal goodness and charity of these latter; but to them the leading ideas of an age seething with reform movements (from, say, the appearance of *Sybil* in 1843 to the Education Act of 1870) were matters of small importance compared with the date of the Book of Daniel or the question of whether the Athanasian Creed should be retained! Despite his personal purity and rhetorical brilliance, Mrs Ward cannot help holding it against Liddon that questions of social betterment seemed to be of far less urgency to him than "the principle of authority", or the means whereby the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch might be upheld against "infidel criticism".

Mrs Ward's charges against Liddon in this connection have a *prima facie* justice. But when reviewed in the light of his total achievement, they require some modification. There is, of course, no denying that Liddon did give a great deal of thought to textual criticism of a kind which no longer seems as urgent as it did in the 1860's and 70's. But to a man who was trying to *live* the belief that the Anglican ministry ought to be "Apostolic" in more than outward semblance, it was essential that the Scriptures should first be seen for what they actually are—that is to say, a corpus of documents delivered to us for the purpose of rekindling the divine message as originally received by Christ's immediate followers. Hooker declared that "the principal cause of *writing* the Gospel was, *that it might be preached upon* or interpreted by public ministers apt and authorized thereunto".¹ In a sermon on "The Apostolic Office" Liddon said that

Looking at their (the Gospels') manner of composition and structural method, it is hardly probable that each Evangelist sat down to write his narrative as a modern author might sit down to write a book from memory, or out of the contents of old documents lying before him. The Gospels are evidently made up out of the contemporary preaching of the Apostles; and their differences in method and style are largely to be accounted for by the differences in the audiences which the Apostles addressed. . . .²

This is well said, albeit controversial. But in Liddon's hands the paleographical and linguistic approaches to Biblical study subserve spiritual and cultural ends. When in the pulpit he aimed to bring out the inner significance of scriptural writings in a way that was generally interesting as well as scholastically irreproachable.

Liddon's explanation in "The Cleansing of the Temple" of the rage exhibited by Jesus in the presence of the money-changers³ is a comparatively simple instance of his ability to smoothe away what appear to be puzzling contraries on the surface of the New Testament narrative (it could be paralleled in the sermons of many another preacher). But Liddon also pursues "original meanings" in a manner which is completely free from the pedantry and fussy ostentation sometimes inevitable in detailed Biblical scholarship. In a sermon on "The Time of Visitation", for example, he shows how the sense usually attributed to "visitation" in familiar speech is not quite sufficient to enable us to understand the text he has chosen to preach from. A visitation, he says,

is, properly speaking, an overlooking; that is the meaning of the original word. It is thus used to describe the office of an Apostle in the Acts of the Apostles, and the office of Bishop in St. Paul's first Epistle to Timothy. . . .⁴

Similarly (as Liddon explains elsewhere) the Scriptural sense of the word "publican" is not simply "one who keeps a public house" but signifies a collector of public taxes who by reason of the fact that he had accepted office under the government of Rome was regarded by his Jewish compatriots as something of a renegade. More interesting than either of these citations, perhaps, is Liddon's explanation of the word "wisdom" as used in certain Biblical contexts. "Let us here remark," he says in a sermon on "The Justification of Wisdom",

that the word Wisdom in our Lord's mouth had an especial significance. As He pronounced it His more instructed hearers would have recognised an ancient and a consecrated word. In the Book of Proverbs the Wisdom of God is no mere quality, or attribute, corresponding in God to what would be wisdom in man; it is more

than an attribute, it is almost what we should call in modern language a person. . . .⁶

The veiled implication that the Bible yields its subtleties only to well-instructed hearers could hardly have been more tactfully suggested than in this way.

For we must, as Liddon hints, give Scriptural expressions an opportunity to disclose their full potency. And this depends upon the habit of constantly "taking phrases to pieces". This precept (it derives from Liddon's *University Sermons*) must also be applied to the words and phrases ordinarily used in discussing religion. In a sermon on "The Fall of Jericho" (*University Sermons*), for example, Liddon complains that the word "faith" is now used vaguely to denote confidence in something or other coming to pass; in "The Conqueror of Satan" (*Passiontide Sermons*) he analyses the expression "evil principle"; and in "The Pharisee" he notes how the word "religion" itself has come to be debased by talk of a "religion of humanity", a "religion of art", or a "religion of politics", while "properly speaking, religion means a certain relation of dependence and obligation between the soul and God".⁶ During the course of a sermon preached in 1877 on "The Courage of Faith", Liddon brought into play a species of "practical criticism" which is indicative of an interesting capacity for perceptive reading. His text (Rom. 1. 16) is "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ". On this Liddon comments:

We are struck at first by the reserved and negative phrase; it seems to fall below the requirements of the occasion, and the character of the man. Is this, we ask, the language of passionate feeling, so strong that it shrinks from the attempt to say what it is, and ventures only to say what it is not? Or is there some subtle irony, flavouring the phrase that seems thus to disappoint us? No, this cannot be. Putting other considerations aside, this mood is inconsistent with what those who knew him best would anticipate from the simplicity of the Apostle's literary manner. And yet, if we understand him literally, how is this mere negative state of feeling equal to the desire which burns within him, or worthy of his past and present relations to the Gospel of his Lord and Master?⁷

This kind of interpretation is nothing more than an attempt to educe the full literary quality of St Paul's words—an effort to perform on behalf of the text something which is not quite completed when the average Biblical commentator has finished his task.

Liddon's preoccupation with the structure of Biblical meaning was partly the outcome of his consciousness that the Eastern mind

observes different linguistic conventions from those which have obtained in Western civilizations. He dwells on this in his sermon on "The Words of Christ" (August 1880). Whereas a persuasive Western discourse (as Liddon puts it) is like a living organism, each part of it related to the other parts, an Eastern *pronunciamento* is "as often as not a collection of sayings which have the loosest connection with each other . . . (and) resemble in their entirety, not a living organism, but a heap of polished stones, each of which is in itself perfect and beautiful, while it has no necessary connection with the rest. . . ." ⁸ And he quotes the Suras, the long sections of the Koran, as examples of this quality. The coherence and comparative sophistication of St Paul's writing is due, Liddon argues, to the fact that St Paul was "more than half a Western". But Jesus was addressing himself to *Eastern* people: ". . . He spoke to men as an Eastern man would speak, and therefore it is impossible to assume that close and exclusive connection between one sentence in His discourses and another, which would be natural in a speaker of the Western world". ⁹ Similarly with the modes of logic. The Scribes "were masters of a kind of reasoning which, however little suited to Western and modern tastes, was in its way subtle and effective. . . ." ¹⁰ And Jesus' manner of affirming a truth and then leaving it to evoke a response in the soul of the hearer is contrasted with the Socratic method of propounding an intellectual proposition in such a way as to make the auditor anxious to work out from it an answer to the question set in front of him. The "habit of seizing truth intuitively and enunciating it authoritatively" is represented as the *natural manner* of an oriental mind. ¹¹

Another point which Liddon makes is that in the East, action (and its attendant symbolism) is regarded as a form of communication to a much greater extent than it is among Westerners. In the East, Liddon tells us (in "Christ in the Storm"),

action is a language to a degree unknown to us of the West. The solemn prophetic actions of Isaiah, Hosea, and others recognise and illustrate the Oriental way of looking at such subjects, and our Lord addresses Himself to it in more than one of His miracles, by gestures which were . . . unnecessary to the execution of His purpose, but full of meaning for the lookers-on. In ancient Palestine, the acts of the Prophet of Nazareth would have had, and would have been designed to carry, a meaning beyond themselves. . . . ¹²

This is illustrated later on with reference to "The Curse of the Fig Tree"; in this case we may be sure, Liddon says, that the symbolic

significance of Christ's action in causing the tree to be blasted would not be lost on his immediate followers.

Liddon's ability to balance the attributes of different civilizations one against another is always apparent in his sermons (see especially "The Light of the Lord" in *Advent at St Paul's*, 1892). In those which were intended to have a distinctly "contemporary" note, he was concerned to intimate the ways in which secularism was bearing down upon the ideal of "Apostolic" ministration. Liddon did not allow himself to be intimidated by the advance of scientific rationalism. He had no hesitation, for instance, in proclaiming that the evolutionists had really magnified the cosmic significance of God, not diminished its importance. Of more immediate interest, perhaps, was the question, "What kind of creature is man?" The evidence of the rocks lent a fresh pertinence to speculation on the ultimate "destiny" of the human race, as Liddon acknowledges in some detail in "The Law of Death";¹³ and this became, as is well known, material for thousands of sermons. Liddon discusses the cultural implications of belief in personal immortality during the course of "The Worth of Faith in a Life to Come";¹⁴ and against the scientist's contention that man is merely a perishing "and on the whole a very unfortunate" animal—unfortunate because too highly endowed for purely animal well-being—he sets the doctrine that man is essentially a *spirit*, "whatever be the dignity and organic indispensableness of his outward form".¹⁵ In "The Word made Flesh", Liddon argues that men do not really believe what philosophers tell them about the insignificance of human beings; for no sooner is some unfortunate individual put on trial for his life than he immediately becomes an object of general interest, which would not be the case if his fellow men regarded him merely as an animal "whose deeds and whose death are alike ordered by fate. . . ." ¹⁶ Liddon's several disquisitions on the life after death lay emphasis on the salutary effect exerted upon the mind by the consciousness of something before us of which we are not yet in possession.

"Can any theory of human progress", Liddon asks, "dare to claim our attention, which, while not venturing to reject [the] tremendous truths [respecting the after-life], yet does in practice proceed as if they were uncertain or improbable?" ¹⁷ And this, of course, has its influence on his teaching about the disposition of our present life. As he says in "The Unjust Steward",

It is in the thought of death, and of the account which follows it, that we learn to take healthy views of life; healthy, and therefore stern, views of sin; healthy, and therefore moderate, views of the real worth of the world's opinion; healthy, and therefore exacting, views of the unspeakable value of the soul.¹⁸

When we read Liddon's injunctions on such matters as self-denial and the use of leisure, it is as well to remember that he seldom had time to deliver "cottage lectures", but was mainly addressing himself to middle-class churchgoers. What he has to say by way of counsel to perfection in these matters happens to be consonant with a good deal of Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy*. Liddon's critique of modern civilization is delivered to us *en passant*, and it exhibits none of the adroit *savoir faire* such as characterizes Arnold's treatise. But Liddon nevertheless has his own methods of dispensing sweetness and light—which he does in a spirit quite remote from that of the Evangelical Hebraizers.

Liddon's conception of social improvement is rather different from that shared by Mrs Humphrey Ward and her colleagues.¹⁹ It is, he feels, part of the minister's business to foster a notion of what a "true human civilization" is. In "What are we working for?" Liddon states that a true civilization is a moral or spiritual civilization, and

it is attained when a man's material progress has reached the exact point at which it affords the greatest assistance, and offers the least obstruction to that mental and moral growth in which the excellence of man himself, as distinct from that of anything outside him, pre-eminently consists.²⁰

Man is indeed an immortal spirit, "capable of comprehending the significance of [his] own existence, capable of knowing the Author of [his] being, capable of freely deciding to obey or to defy Him".²¹ But Liddon is sufficiently of his time to concede that man is also a social animal.²² And in "What are we working for?" he embarks upon a discussion of the position which the Church ought to adopt in the current struggle between Labour and Capital. "Most assuredly", he concludes,

in such a controversy the Church cannot stand aside, in an attitude of anything like indifference. She has duties towards both the elder and the younger brother in this controversy. . . .²³

That pronouncement, to say the least, is honest and unambiguous.

But it might be argued (by sympathizers with the Balliol group, for example) that the recognition of the necessity Liddon here acknowledges should lead the Church to embrace the opportunity

of intervening in public affairs. But can it usefully do so without weakening its own power to perform its primary duties? Liddon's statement that

She [the Church] must remind capital of the duties of an unselfish care for the bodies and souls of men; and she must remind labour—organised labour—that its best claims upon the attention of capitalised wealth may be fatally weakened by the indulgence of class hatreds or the promotion of vulgar personal ambitions²⁴

might seem naïve and feeble to an advanced social thinker. Political life is not beyond the scope of religion, for Christianity must "control a Christian when [he is] acting in his public and political capacity as completely as when he is engaged in the duties which belong to him as a member of a family circle".²⁵ But when Liddon says:

. . . beyond this, the clergy at any rate can hardly hope to interfere with advantage; and if they stand aloof it is not necessarily from want of courage, but because as a class they must be conscious of not possessing the special knowledge which is needed for useful interference. . . .²⁶

he is merely stating in his own terms that he believes his own office to have affinities with that of the critic, who must, according to Matthew Arnold, "keep out of the region of immediate practice in the political, social, humanitarian sphere, if he wants to make a beginning for that more free speculative treatment of things which may perhaps one day make its benefits felt even in this sphere, but in a natural and thence irresistible manner".²⁷

It is only fair to both parties, incidentally, to recall that Liddon seized on "the brilliant and light-hearted author" of *Literature and Dogma* as a reckless disseminator of misleading simplifications. In "The Accepted Offering" (*Passiontide Sermons*) he castigates Arnold for his statement that the God of Israel was only "an abstract, an eternal Power, or only a stream of tendency, not ourselves making for righteousness"; and in a later sermon on "The Day of Judgment" (*Advent at St. Paul's*) he points out the fallacy implicit in Arnold's claim that religion is practical duty invested with a glow of emotion. This suffices to demonstrate that in his own sphere Liddon had very little in common with Arnold. But that a modern Apostle should adopt a point of view not immediately appreciated by the social case-worker is no reason for assuming that he is callously indifferent to contemporary complexities. Liddon's discussion of the Positivist philosophy in "The Honour of Humanity"

and of the various forms of "materialism" in "Faith in a Holy Ghost" has particular relevance here.²⁸

Indeed, some of Liddon's pronouncements on the economic situation of his time are strikingly apposite to the social theorizing of his detractors. He is always eloquent on the Tragedy of Waste. And in his sermon "What are we working for?" he gives us an interesting example of his capacity to see economic objectives as in themselves they really are. He is discussing the functional, as distinct from the merely acquisitive or possessive attitude towards wealth and property. No doubt the ancient world had its own estimate of the relative value of bread and circuses,

But the idea that the real use of money is to minister to pleasure and amusement is common enough among Christians today: and they are so far worse than the old Pagan rulers at Rome, that instead of furnishing pleasures to those who cannot pay for them, they often reflect with satisfaction that their enjoyments are a distinction, since they are not shared by anybody else. . . .²⁹

In modern times there must inevitably be large-scale expenditure on projects designed to provide amusements for the populace. But ostentatious waste and conspicuous consumption must never be held up as good in themselves. They make people unappreciative of the value of *real* wealth. On the subject of war—the arch-waster of human energy—it is as well to recall that Liddon (as his *Life and Letters* shows) knew far better than the majority of English statesmen the questions at issue in the struggle for power in Eastern Europe; his observations on the Bulgarian atrocities of 1876 acquit him of any kind of political lethargy. In "Prejudice and Experience" he made a pertinent reference to the Franco-Prussian War which has far more than a topical interest. Liddon says that apart from the immediate effect of the war itself, a greater evil than war is beginning to show itself. People are

growing to be indifferent to human suffering, because, forsooth, suffering is on so great a scale, that the imagination cannot master it in detail, and because national feeling is degraded down to a point at which human life weighs for very little against schemes of military conquest. The true import of this may be disguised beneath high-sounding formulas, but it means the abasement of the leading nations of the world; it means the political and social depression of the vanquished; it means, too probably, the moral degradation of the conqueror.³⁰

Liddon's habitual refusal to divorce questions of politics and diplomacy from the effect which political manoeuvring has on

social welfare would seem to place him among the Liberals of his time. And yet at the general elections he cast his vote for the Conservative candidate!

Liddon would not give assent to the view that in the social sphere all men are equal. This did not necessarily commit him to the embarrassment of having to share Mr Bounderby's opinion that the underprivileged classes of Britain expected "to be set up in a coach and six, and to be fed on turtle soup and venison with a golden spoon". But he did desire to keep the ruling class of his day in power, and scorned the attempt made by the German socialist Wilhelm Weitling (1808-71) to trace the right of the needy to "help themselves out of the possessions of their well-to-do neighbours".³¹ At the same time he was prepared to abide by the unwritten law that the right of property—the foundation of our social system—is a sacred right only so long as the owner gives due recognition to the responsibilities imposed upon him by possession. "A rightful owner" holds what is entrusted to him "not simply in his own right, but in trust for the nation, in trust for the poor, and his rights over it are traversed by serious liabilities . . ."³² In making utterances such as this, Liddon was perhaps throwing sand against the wind, and similar words were on the lips of many another preacher; nevertheless the "waste of God's goods by His human stewards" remained an incubus he did not succeed in shifting.

All accounts of Liddon's preaching agree that he was powerfully oratorical in style, though without the "slightly manneristic torrent" of eloquence such as Bishop Wilberforce was accustomed to deliver. It is said that in his discourses Liddon seemed to *assume* nothing; and indeed, his unwillingness to leave a subject until he had chased away all excuses for mal-comprehension goes far to account for the great length of his sermons. We learn from his *Life and Letters* that these often lasted an hour and forty minutes; and even in his Oxford days he thought nothing of preaching for well over an hour. In her essay on Dr John Cumming, George Eliot noted that a preacher is bound to be diffuse;³³ and this must certainly be admitted to be true of Liddon—though one needs to make the qualification that in his case the augmentations, digressions, and repetitions which occur so frequently in his sermons are not there out of deference to ministerial obligation. He is not merely *beating out* his material into palatable form. Anything in the nature of *précis* diminishes the force and intricacy of his arguments; the

rhythm of his prose, moreover, gains momentum from interjections not strictly necessary to the sense.

In his Diary for 16 July 1861, Stopford Brooke wrote:

Book English and sermon English are as distinct as possible. The latter must partake of a colloquial character and have more of passion and abruptness than can be permitted in composition for the public . . .³⁴

In spite of his occasional floridity, Liddon managed to strike a suitable balance between book English and sermon English. His addresses are tempered with a degree of taste and moderation which are the outcome of a certain scrupulosity deriving, perhaps, from contact with none but the best literary models. For on those occasions when sermonese might seem to be called for (funerals, ominous events, etc.) Liddon managed to do without it entirely. His style and manner are said to have "influenced more than one generation of English clergymen".³⁵ If this influence was strong enough to curb an indulgence in the fulsome verbosity of which Lord Lytton's Parson Dale in *My Novel* (1852) was such a master, it certainly achieved more than the ordination lecturers were able to. The Reverend Mr Dale, as it happens, had very little interest in the "deep theology, [or] archaeological learning that distinguish the rising generation of the clergy . . ." to which, of course, Liddon belonged. It is strangely ironical that after Liddon's death, ephemeral pulpit addresses of the kind represented by Mr Dale's "sermons that preach *at* you" were appealed to in order to secure congregations for the churches—many of which owed their very existence to the Tractarian aftermath. Liddon's own sermons are among the more accessible literary monuments left to posterity by what Liddon himself, in referring to Newman's final celebration of Holy Communion in the English Church, called "a religious effort which had failed".³⁶

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Advent at St. Paul's* (ed. 1892).
Christmastide Sermons (4th ed., 1893).
Clerical Life and Work (ed. 1894).
Passiontide Sermons (4th ed., 1895).
Sermons on Some Words of Christ (2nd ed., 1892).
Some Elements of Religion (1870, 9th ed., 1895).
University Sermons (1st and 2nd series in one volume, 1891).
 J. O. Johnson, *Life and Letters of H. P. Liddon* (1904).

- ¹ *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V, Chapter xxii.
- ² *Sermons on Some Words of Christ* (1892), pp. 139-40.
- ³ *Ibid.*, pp. 288ff.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 255.
- ⁵ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 153.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 230.
- ⁷ *University Sermons*, 2nd Series, p. 192.
- ⁸ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 2.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.
- ¹⁰ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, pp. 6-7.
- ¹¹ *Some Elements of Religion* (1870), Lecture VI.
- ¹² *University Sermons*, 2nd Series, pp. 133-4.
- ¹³ *Advent in St. Paul's*, pp. 55-6.
- ¹⁴ *University Sermons*, 2nd series, pp. 46-54 and *passim*.
- ¹⁵ *Some Elements of Religion*, Lecture III.
- ¹⁶ *Christmastide Sermons*, p. 132.
- ¹⁷ "The Law of Progress" in *University Sermons*, 1st series, p. 35; see also "The Honour of Humanity": *ibid.*, p. 48.
- ¹⁸ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 190.
- ¹⁹ See, however, the sermon "Humility and Truth" (section B) in *University Sermons*, 2nd series, where Liddon pauses to pay a tribute to the "submerged tenth".
- ²⁰ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 173.
- ²¹ *University Sermons*, 1st series, p. 48.
- ²² See the discussion of the social instincts in "The Worth of Faith in a Life to Come", *University Sermons*, 2nd series, p. 55.
- ²³ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 162.
- ²⁴ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 163.
- ²⁵ "The Courage of Faith": *University Sermons*, 2nd series, p. 205.
- ²⁶ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 163.
- ²⁷ Matthew Arnold; "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time" in *Essays in Criticism*, 1st series.
- ²⁸ *University Sermons*, 1st series, pp. 46, 234-51.
- ²⁹ *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 168.
- ³⁰ *University Sermons*, 2nd series, pp. 12-13.
- ³¹ *Passiontide Sermons*, p. 173.
- ³² *Sermons on Some Words of Christ*, p. 181. ("The Unjust Steward").
- ³³ George Eliot, *Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book*. 2nd ed. 1884 (included in most editions of *The Impressions of Theophrastus Such*).
- ³⁴ (ed.) L. P. Jacks, *Life and Letters of Stopford Brooke* (1917), Vol. I, p. 121.
- ³⁵ S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (1915) 2nd ed., 1932, p. 221.
- ³⁶ Quoted in Geoffrey Faber, *Oxford Apostles* (Penguin Books edition, 1954), pp. 410.

REGRESS FROM METHODISM

ARTHUR MATTHEWS

THE reasons for change from my position as a Methodist Superintendent Minister after nearly twenty years in the ministry to that of a member of the Church of England are necessarily involved. It is true to say that all the factors operative may not be present even now in my own consciousness. It is certain however that it was a long process of struggle against natural affection and loyalty to the denomination in which I served.

Through the years the anomalous position of Methodism at the time of the Wesleys was relived in my own experience. My father was an Anglican, remaining loyal at heart to the Church in which he was confirmed while normally attending a Methodist chapel for the sake of family unity. Thus it was that at Easter and whenever possible we were taken back to his old Parish Church at Newark for the Greater Festivals. No matter how many years separated me from England, as the seasons came round, I remembered first and foremost the great reverence, beauty, and dignity of some of those services, the processional Litany, the Easter services. I had always been in revolt against that type of Nonconformity which built squat and ugly structures as a protest against what it felt to be "Romish" tendencies in the Church of England, a type which in latter years, particularly in South Africa, has completely died out. And so once more in my adolescence, though now active in Methodist Sunday School work and a Lay Preacher at sixteen, I turned to the local parish churches in Nottingham, which were the only churches open apart from the Roman and which alone seemed to have an atmosphere, reverence, and sanctity, for a great deal of my private and weekday personal devotion and meditation. So completely had this become a habit, that following the completion of my primary training at Sheffield and acceptance for the South African Methodist Ministry, my last devotional acts on English soil were offered in St Paul's Cathedral and at Westminster Abbey on my way through to catch the ship. The following years were ones of intense work and

study, mostly spent on the mission field but broken by several years' war service in Africa and the Middle East as a chaplain to the Forces. At one stage of my ministry I also found myself preparing African candidates for the Methodist Ministry and teaching theology.

It would be true to say, however, that my own conversion was the result, not in the first case of intellectual or theological problems—these came later—but of practical difficulties and deficiencies arising from an imperfect system of belief which became more and more apparent as the years went on and to which Methodism in Africa seemed to be incapable of answering within the framework of its own system. The very fact that Methodism has a high quality of spiritual life, and that many of its ministers are devoted, as is clearly seen in the continued maintenance and expansion of its work among both white and black, masked for me, as it does for so many, the essential incompleteness of its ministry and witness. It is nevertheless true to say that, especially among the ranks of its ministers, there is a growing awareness that something, somewhere, is wrong. I emphasize the vagueness deliberately, remembering the heart-searchings which some had in my day, when, as we groped in the dark, all manner of solutions were sought for the sense of deficiency within. Resolutions were introduced into the Synods, and defeated, urging a return to the Episcopacy. A yearning was felt for the possibility of reunion with the Church of England and with other Churches working in Africa. This was made more poignant by our proximity to the mission field, where schism among the Churches was known by us all to be a perilous sin, not only destroying Christian unity, but in the last resort creating a confusion which in practice set up a denial of the Fatherhood of God and the great Brotherhood of Men. It was for instance, a commonly known fact that the Government had listed some 500 so-called denominations representing Bantu Christians. Our own divisions, to our eternal shame, had reduced the unity of Christian witness and love to a mockery.

But if vague, the sense of incompleteness was nevertheless real. It was stated more explicitly by the principal of the theological college, afterwards President of the Conference, nearly twenty years ago when he said to us students that the *raison d'être* for the separate existence of a Methodist Church had gone. This statement remained in my mind and I was to feel the truth of it. Methodism

which began in reaction against the background of a Church life when at a low ebb, was nevertheless founded as a spiritual movement by the Wesleys within the Anglican Communion. Both the brothers need mention, as the hymns Charles wrote were as indispensable to Methodism's growth and life as John's preaching. Both John and Charles Wesley remained convinced Churchmen until their death and no matter how inconsistent John's Anglicanism became or how irretrievable the steps he took toward separation, the constant exhortation of the two brothers to the Conference and to the people was that Methodism ought to remain within the Anglican fold.

Methodism began with primary emphasis on scriptural holiness, simplicity of worship, conversion, and an insistence on the reality and possibility of a life sanctified and made whole by the Holy Spirit. A high moral standard of living was effected as well as a deep piety, which was like a breath of sweet fresh air in the complacent atmosphere of that day. But it was as much a revival born of its Mother, the Anglican Church, as was the Oxford Movement a hundred years later. The tragedy, realized by many in Methodism to-day, is that the one resulted in schism and a reactionism which irretrievably impoverished the new Methodist movement. The other, in spite of those like Newman who went over to Rome, continued as a growing force within the Church itself, enriched and purified it, and called it again to heroic life, high endeavour, and new consecration.

Thus the very conditions which brought Methodism to birth have gone. The Church of England has returned to a deeper conception of personal holiness as well as to a purer form of Catholic faith and practice than she had ever attained in her history before. As against this fact the first fires of Methodist Evangelism have died down and conditions have changed. The old extreme reactionism has largely gone, particularly among its ministers, and in its place has come a groping for the things that have been lost from the Catholic tradition of the Church. The Catholicity of the Church, of course, lies in the ultimate spiritual truths which belong to it. The strength of Protestantism and of Methodism rests in the emphasis or re-discovery of certain elements of Catholic truth. Methodism acknowledges this in its preface to the Deed of Union of 1932 which states: "The Methodist Church claims and cherishes its place in the Holy Catholic Church which is the Body of Christ. It

rejoices in the inheritance of the historic creeds and of the Protestant Reformation."

It was my last six years as superintendent of a vast area covering many thousand square miles, nearly one hundred African churches and preaching places, some twenty-two day schools, an institution, a hospital, together with several European churches, which finally crystallized my sense of inherent deficiency under what is often in the Methodist system a very imposing façade. In the towns, a mediocre witness and an imperfect ministry can get by with the aid of the comparative degree of fellowship and contact which bolster up one's own consecrated endeavour. In an isolated Missionary District a hundred miles from one's nearest colleague, the system is seen for what it is. The lack of authority in its ministry, the weakness of its government with its denial of the episcopalian form of leadership, the subjective nature of its approach to the sacraments, and the glaring folly of schism, these and other defects in faith and practice are thrown in sharp relief against the vitality and proven truth of age-old Catholic tradition.

It is necessary to examine these things in greater detail to appreciate their seriousness. Some, because of an intense and most worthy desire for reunion, would minimize them. It is my belief that those who would waive or neglect the fundamental theological principles involved, would do so to the dire peril of the Anglican Church and the efficacy of its continued witness.

Beginning with Government or Authority, let us briefly consider the Methodist system against the conception of the Apostolic Succession within the Anglican Communion. Canon Quick in his book on the Christian Sacraments says that the idea of validity as applied to Holy Orders and the Sacraments seems to the Free Churchmen to be a barren and abstract formalism. This is so. Ministers are "called" direct by God, and, after fulfilling the conditions of training and suitability laid down by the individual Church Councils, are approved and ordained, at any rate within Methodism, by a form of ordination similar in many respects to that of the Anglican Ordinal. But this ordination sets the seal of the approval of the Free Church upon the ministry of the individual. His reception of the Holy Spirit at ordination, in spite of a ceremony of the laying on of hands, is conceived of as subjective and as conditional upon his state of heart and surrender to God.

This subjective emphasis is one which runs through the centre of Free Church thought. The individual is "saved by grace", just as a minister's work is made vital according to his own surrender to God and reception of the Grace and Spirit of God. Denying the principle of Apostolic Succession, all Methodist Ministers, logically equal in authority and for purposes of administration, elect a Chairman to preside over District Synods, a President to preside over their National Conference (the latter annually), and regard legislative authority as being vested in the Conference, which is a representative body of lay and ministerial members.

Methodism is justly proud of its organizational ability and of the administrative machine which it has created. It certainly represents one side of the truth and one which Anglicans realize must be ever in the forefront of their own mind, namely, the need for constant and daily devotion and surrender in order that the trust received may be worthily fulfilled. It lays stress on that state of personal holiness without which neither priest nor people can represent nor serve God. But on the other side Methodist organization approximates far more nearly to that of a limited liability company, even granting that it is a spiritual company, than to that of the ancient tradition and concept of the Church. The Chairman is an elected leader among equals who themselves have a large measure of autonomy under superintendents, subject only in the last resort through the District Synods to Conference, and in this Chairmanship the whole rich concept of the Episcopal Office is lost. The Chairman is himself a circuit minister, with all the corresponding duties to fulfil. He is again, by virtue of his office, superintendent of his own circuit, an office between that of parish priest and archdeacon, but containing wider and more direct powers than either. These facts limit him in the exercise of his executive powers.

More vitally, there is no idea whatever that the ministry of the clergy is a "given" ministry or that they function on his behalf in their work and administration of the Sacraments. Nor is there the power of ordination vested in the Methodist Chairman, nor inevitably, the intimate knowledge, fellowship, or oversight of or with them, such as exists in the special and peculiar relation of the Anglican Bishop to his clergy. I speak primarily of the Church of the Province of South Africa, as after twenty-one years' absence my knowledge of British conditions is necessarily imperfect. But there is in the Methodist system, what in my own case was felt so

acutely, a sense of isolation, a loss of spiritual fellowship and leadership, which does not exist in the Anglican system in Africa. There, the Bishop, set apart, in a unique office, with a holy tradition, and as we believe, the recipient of special powers of the Holy Spirit by virtue of his holy office and the Laying-on of Hands, functions in a special relationship, the first made vivid in the Sacrament of Ordination, the second through Confirmation.

It was this acute sense of loss which prompted several resolutions to the South African Methodist Conference: (1) That there should be a return to an episcopal form of government, with Chairmen being consecrated Bishops; and (2) that such Bishops should be separated or set apart from all normal parish duties. The first resolution was defeated, the second part of it accepted in principle. This was of course a limited conception even in its entirety, but is indicative of the trend of thought, particularly in view of the fact that the resolutions were introduced from several Districts simultaneously. This question of Church government is a fundamental one, and the cause of much loss and suffering within the ranks of the Methodist ministry. For instance, from my own college year the greater part of the collegiates have left, transferred from Methodism to other Churches, or broken down. One can only deduce that there is an essential weakness in the whole concept of Church Government and Holy Orders in Methodism which stems directly from the denial of the Apostolic Succession and a valid Episcopacy.

Through this denial come other essential differences in functions. The Conference authorizes ordination, and appoints certain Chairmen, the President and/or, other senior ministers, to operate in a collective ceremony of Ordination which usually takes place annually, during the sitting of the Conference. This includes a form of the Laying-on of Hands, but is opposed to the Anglican system where the Bishop alone has the power and the authority to ordain. The local circuit minister, the equivalent of the parish priest, performs all normal Confirmation ceremonies, as against the Anglican rule which prescribes this ceremony as the prerogative and special function of the Bishop by virtue of his office. Methodists would say it would be quite impracticable for Chairmen to perform all Confirmation ceremonies in view of the large areas in which they operate and their other normal duties. This is quite true, but points again to the difference between the two Churches in their belief in

the nature of the office, and does not in the slightest detract from the truth that an essential part of the manifestation of the unity of the Church is lost in the Methodist system, and that the Chairman of the District tends to become an executive, though in a spiritual organization, instead of the father of the diocese in direct contact with all the souls within that diocese, standing too in a unique relation to his clergy.

The question of "validity" is equally important with regard to the office of Priest, or its Methodist equivalent, the circuit minister. The Anglican Bishop remains a priest, with his clergy functioning as a "given" ministry. There issues from their ordination and office an essentially different belief, not merely as to the place they occupy in the life of the Church but of the inner meaning of the Sacraments. Without the belief in the priestly office of the clergy in a special sense as Anglicans understand it, there can be no full interpretation of the Sacraments and particularly of the Holy Eucharist. It is here that later Methodism parted company even with her Founders' beliefs. The Wesleys, as is well known, were what would be known to-day as "High" Churchmen or Anglo-Catholic in their thought of the Sacraments. Later Methodism deviated from their view, and while retaining substantially the Anglican form of service, took out of it anything which they at that time thought had a "Romanist" flavour. As a consequence, implicitly at first and then explicitly, they arrived at the position where they denied the "Real Presence" as Anglicans understand it in the Eucharist, regarded any form of interpretation except spiritual subjectivism as only a form in other words for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, and eventually arrived at the position, still maintained generally in Methodist Churches to-day, similar to that in Presbyterian Churches, where Holy Communion is celebrated once a quarter. The emphasis remains on the receptivity of the Communicant, the Memorial Aspect of the Sacrament, and the Meeting with our Lord in a spiritual sense at the Communion Table. Note the difference in terminology: it is not an Altar but a Communion Table.

As the tide of reactionism has receded, however, and a fresh study of tradition has begun among more recent scholars, so has the realization gained ground that the present Methodist official position gives only one side, if an important side, of the profound Mystery of the Blessed Sacrament. Some thirty years or more ago,

a new movement was started within the Methodist Church in England calling itself the "Sacramental Society", which was able to rise above earlier fears. The Society had its counterpart in the American Methodist Episcopal Church. It laid new emphasis on the tradition of the Catholic Church, studied patristic thought, urged regular celebration and a return to liturgical forms of worship, and managed to produce some forms in a new Book of Offices and in the new Methodist Hymn Book. It went further in Africa and made the central Sunday morning service a liturgical one for its African converts. It laid emphasis on the necessity of beauty in architecture and worship, was not afraid to use the cross and crucifix and other aids in private and public worship, and began to return to a conception of something "done" in the Blessed Sacrament and of the "Real Presence". The Reverend E. Rattenbury for instance, one of its exponents, states in his book on *Wesley's Legacy to the World*, that the "Sacrament of Holy Communion is not merely a symbol of grace, but an instrument", and he goes on to say that the "material elements contain a spiritual vitality". He quotes Charles Wesley's hymn: "To every faithful soul appear And shew Thy Real Presence here." He also says that the Wesleys would have accepted Archbishop Temple's term "Transvaluation" in regard to the Blessed Sacrament.

It is still weak language and an incomplete interpretation. It would not be true either to say that all Methodists have followed even the limited approach of the Sacramental Society, just as all Anglicans are not Anglo-Catholics. The influence of the Movement has, however, been felt by all, and it is not uncommon in Africa to find regular celebrations nor to find an increasing use of liturgical worship. In these respects the conservative influence of the laity is one of the chief retarding factors. Some ministers, as a result of the thought engendered by the Movement, went over to the Church of England; most began to realize afresh that the division between the Church of England and Methodism was at the least regrettable.

Modern Methodism as a whole, however, still has to regain or recapture the sense of holy awe, of the Anamnesis—the Re-presenting of our Lord's Sacrifice—his Passion, Death and Resurrection manifest in the Holy Eucharist. It has to recapture the knowledge that the Eucharist is not merely the most holy rite and memorial which the Church may celebrate, but is indeed the centre of the Church's life. A Sacrament, not merely for occasional use,

but the most vital living channel through which Christ himself comes again through the elements of the bread and wine. Methodism needs to re-establish the Eucharist in the place it had in the early days of the Apostolic Church, when in the midst of persecution and death, the gift of the Spirit through the Eucharist maintained and nourished its members in and as the Body of Christ, making the Kingdom of God a present reality as well as a future fact. Methodism needs to re-discover the twofold action of the Eucharist. Christ imparts his Life, Spirit, and Presence to the believer and, as Irenaeus said, "The poor widow the Church casts in all her life into the treasury of God". Here is the corporate offering of the Church to God in the love, adoration, and sacrifice of its people. As Dom Gregory Dix so pertinently puts it, "The Church offers itself to God at the Offertory to become the sacrificed Body of Christ, the Sacrament, in order that She may become within time the 'fulness' or fulfilment of Christ."

Again, Methodism needs to rediscover its own assertions on the importance of the difference between faith and feeling, particularly in relation to the Sacraments: that baptized children are not only dedicated as is so commonly held, nor are they merely heirs to the Kingdom of Heaven, but are by virtue of the Sacrament inheritors; and that in the Holy Eucharist specified conditions of receptivity are no more than spiritual arrogance, limiting by our frail human nature the whole Majesty of God's Power and Love, the matchless promise of Christ to come to us and impart his life in us, and his command to "Do this". We thank God that no matter how frail, how imperfect our own receptivity, our Lord does come to us, not only because of what we are, but so often in spite of it. We can then be no longer content with a formulary which accepts an occasional celebration as the norm, but in love and reverence, cry in answer to the command "As oft as ye drink it"—"Lord, come daily to us at thy Holy Altar and accept in return this, the corporate Sacrifice of thy Church!"

How strange that Methodism, ignoring so much, brought to life again and maintained for many years the ancient "Agape" or Love Feast inherent from the old Jewish *Chaburah* which our Lord made pregnant with new meaning in the Eucharist. Methodists made it a separate festival from the Holy Communion, giving to it both a spiritual as well as a social meaning. But their eyes were closed to the fuller meanings of the Eucharist.

It would of course be futile to deny that the Nonconformist or Free Church view of the Sacraments is bound up with their denial of the Apostolic Succession, that they do not realize the many-sided aspect of the Sacraments, and particularly the Eucharist, because Validity and Authority are unknown territories. It is generally true that the Anglican member will attend Holy Communion whether he has a personal liking for his Priest or not, for he knows that his Priest's imparted authority is greater than any personal limitations which he may possess, and in the main, the Anglican Priest receives a far greater respect from his people by virtue of his priestly office than the Nonconformist Minister. One realizes of course that any such statement calls to mind the exception to the rule. It is just as true that great and saintly Free Church Ministers have exercised some priestly office and spoken out without fear or favour as that some Anglican Priests have not. But the different nature of the Office can and does lead to a very different exercise of it.

One hardly needs to expatiate on the importance of Confession in relation to the priestly office. Modern psychology has only emphasized what was known through the tradition of the Church. Dr Leslie Weatherhead has become the modern Free Church exponent of the synthesis between psychology and religion in its approach to the whole man. But integrated into Catholic tradition and practice is the means by which the Anglican priestly confessor can do more than analyse his patient's disturbances and hear his sins, or delve into his parishioner's sub-conscious or even unconscious mind. He can in God's Name, and by virtue of his holy office, bring the forgiveness of God as well as healing counsel and comfort to sin-stricken souls. To Anglican Priests, psychiatry and confession are no adjunct newly discovered by the modern mind, but by the very nature of the priestly office have been part of its central function and healing power through the centuries. Our Lord gave his Apostles power to forgive sins in the world: "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted" (John 20. 23). Many a psychologist, when the mind's curtain has been pulled back in his consulting room, would give much to be in line with that tradition. The Anglican Church through its Catholic heritage has not lost sight of this great Commission.

The question of authority, with its many facets, was the rock on which my own loyalty and allegiance to the Methodist Church eventually foundered. I had been increasingly concerned about

many of the things mentioned in this paper, wondering how such a position had ever been reached, but most of all I was perplexed by the obvious inconsistency of the Free Church position. Denying authority, it assumed supreme authority and unquestioning obedience in minor as well as major questions of doctrine and practice. Asserting, as its whole justification for existence as a schismatic Church, belief in the freedom of conscience, Methodism gave little to its own adherents. It demanded allegiance for instance to the great common beliefs set forth in the Creeds, the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds and the pronouncements of Chalcedon. It appropriated in my day Anglican text books for its theological teaching on such questions as the Doctrine of God, the Person of Christ, the Work and Nature of the Holy Spirit, but proceeded with sublime indifference to set aside other vital teaching. Assuming that there is no authority for some of the earlier and later traditions (and by authority is meant Scriptural authority), Methodism goes on with confidence to assume authority for pronouncements in other spheres of faith and practice. Methodists in Africa and in England until recently pronounced that dancing was sinful, that total abstinence is a state necessary to spiritual holiness, perhaps even to salvation, and that internal rules of membership, if violated, may and can lead to excommunication. If one assumes a living authority through the guidance of the Holy Spirit to believers in this age, it seems inconsistent to deny the continuity of the Risen Life of Christ expressed through his Church in past and more recent ages—particularly when such vitally and generally accepted principles and beliefs have been handed down in solemn succession and have stood the test of time.

Having seen the deadly peril of schism, the need for a return to Catholic tradition and to the authority of the Church, the vital question then arose for me: Is there indeed any real, logical, or valid position between Nonconformity and Rome? It would need a more scholarly mind than mine to attempt to set out a logical position. But the question was for me completely resolved in the Anglo-Catholic position in the Church of England, and in the light of the practicalities of the present situation in which Rome finds herself. I am able to answer after some years of thought that without doubt reunion with Rome, indeed reunion between Christendom East and West, is a spiritual imperative which must be laid on the heart and mind of all Christians. I believe that Anglo-

Catholics have contributed towards that union by their recognition, appreciation, and in many cases, incorporation into their beliefs and liturgy of that which is Catholic in the Church of Rome. The Church of England has matured beyond the place in which it found itself at the time of the birth of the Oxford Movement when things Roman were necessarily anathema. But the Church of England as a whole, and I personally, cannot go further and accept the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, nor the infallibility of the decisions, judgements, and pronouncements, made under the cover of such a doctrine and incorporated as Canon Law, during past centuries.

My belief and intention then, and I believe it is the belief and intention of many others, is that reunion with Rome is good, necessary, and a charge laid on us all, but that in the present circumstances it is inconsistent with Anglican belief and impossible, at any rate until Roman thought changes. This view, on the other hand, does not represent for me a negative attitude towards the Church of England, nor only a wistful waiting for eventual reunion. I believe that within the Anglican Communion there is a weight of Catholic truth, a spiritual life, an authority, and what must not be overlooked, a Church which with all its defects in the past, has not only stood the test of time, but with its adaptation to the spiritual needs, temperament, and language of the English speaking peoples—and one may say to-day, peoples, too, of other nations and languages—has filled a supreme place in the life of the Church Catholic and Universal. It is more alert than ever in its previous history. Its quality of spiritual life is unquestionable. It has allowed diversity within unity, while remaining faithful to the essential minimum of belief as stated first by the American Bishops in 1886 and secondly by the third Lambeth Conference in 1888 in the Quadrilateral. It has allowed extremes of Evangelical emphasis as well as those of Anglo-Catholic view within its own Communion. It has called men and women from every walk of life to heroic standards of Christian living within Religious Communities which have become spiritual “power houses” for the home and overseas Churches. It stands ready and able as the Body of Christ to meet the challenge of this modern age. It sees a special vocation as a bridge across the divisions of Christendom.

No reflections on the Anglican position or my own relation to it as a former Free Church Minister would be complete without two more intimate additions. The first refers to the comfort and strength

of the daily round of ordered worship which is at the very centre of Catholic tradition. In the daily Eucharist, the saying of the Office, the daily Bible readings, the reading of the Psalter once in thirty days, and in the ordered form of worship, there is a body of daily devotion for Priest and people which has no comparison in Free Church circles. It becomes vital to the Anglican, not merely as an end in itself, but as a devotional basis which is a spur and a background to many a saintly life within the Church. All the Free Church Bible Reading Fellowships and times of private prayer cannot redeem the loss of this body of worship. We turn in the slough of despondency, amid the heartbreak of suffering or the coldness of season when the heavens themselves seem made of brass and God remote, to find in familiar and well-loved words and forms the continuity of worship in which we participate as part of the Body of Christ here on earth. Our people, colleagues, and families the world over join with us, and through the Holy Spirit we breathe, live, and are whole again. A vivid personal recollection of this corporate unity of the Church's daily life of worship is in my mind as I write. As I left England so I returned, to join in an act of thanksgiving with the daily Mattins service in the Abbey. I listened to the choir, shared in the devotions, and as the years passed before my eyes, I thought of the great fellowship of the Church following the same act of prayer and devotion all over the world. Six thousand miles away my Bishop had said the same Office. On the lonely Mission Station, the priests and African people had joined in it—"Though sundered far we meet around the common Mercy Seat", the corporate Body of Christ on earth.

The second addition is on the need for Penitence. Within the Anglican Communion is a profound sense of penitence for its part in the conditions which led to the Methodist separation. It acknowledges with humility its imperfection and guilt during the time of the Wesleys, and feels a burden of responsibility to-day toward making every possible approach to the healing of the breach between Methodism and the Church of England. It acknowledges that as long as the breach remains unhealed the burden of sin remains upon us as a Church, the corporate unity of the Body of Christ is impaired, and it longs and prays for re-union to become possible.

THE BISHOPS AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS

P. A. BROMHEAD

Now that the problem of the reform of the House of Lords seems likely to be coming once again into prominence, it may be useful to attempt a brief review of the part which the bishops have played in the proceedings of the House in recent years.¹ Their membership of the House has often been the subject of criticism, and no doubt will be so again. As some of the criticism is based on the activities of the spiritual Lords in the remote past, it seems to be particularly desirable to base our judgements for the present on a study of more recent times, for which the events of, say, 1831, have little relevance.

The spiritual Lords owed their presence in the medieval Parliament to the fact that they were "magnates" and held land from the King, and their membership has continued down to the present day although the original reason for it ceased to be valid centuries ago. Their constitutional position has been modified in only one respect; in spite of the increase in the number of diocesan bishops during the past hundred years the number of bishops entitled to be members of the House of Lords has not increased. At present, apart from the two Archbishops and the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Durham, only the twenty-one senior bishops are members of the House. Thus, while in the Middle Ages the bishops and abbots often outnumbered the temporal Lords, the number of spiritual Lords in the House has remained constant at twenty-six during the past 350 years, in which the total membership has increased from eighty to more than eight hundred. During this period the real character of the bishops' functions in the House has been completely transformed; they can now be regarded as essentially a group of specialist members whose main task as such is to state, when appropriate, Christian opinions on the problems of the day. The increasing burden of their episcopal duties allows them to attend only very rarely; both this fact and the changing attitude to their political rôle have contributed to the transformation.

In the Middle Ages the spiritual Lords were not only an important part of the membership of the Great Council and of Parliament; they took a large share in the performance of the functions of the great offices of State. After the Reformation their share in the executive offices declined,² but the Archbishop of Canterbury continued, by virtue of his ecclesiastical office, to be at least a nominal member of the Cabinet during the formative years of that body in the eighteenth century.³

The formal procedure for the appointment of bishops, which is prescribed by an Act of Henry VIII, re-enacted by the Act of Supremacy, 1599, is well known, but the actual working of the system is discreetly concealed. On being notified of a vacancy the Crown sends to the dean and chapter a *cong   d'  lire*, together with a letter missive containing the name of the person to be elected. The appointment is thus effectively made by the Prime Minister.

In the eighteenth century, at any rate before the wholesale creation of peers by the younger Pitt, the bishops still formed a numerically important part of the House, and episcopal vacancies afforded a government with most useful opportunity for increasing its strength there. In the words of Turberville, appointments to sees were "as important, politically, as elevations to peerages".⁴ It was, in general, only when ecclesiastical matters came before the House that bishops were inclined to show independence. On ordinary questions a bishop would generally consider himself beholden to the government at whose hands he had received his diocese, and indeed in difficult questions the government of the day might regard the votes of its appointees on the ecclesiastical bench as useful supports and bulwarks against the possibility of defeat.⁵ The effective power of appointing and promoting bishops was an important part of the government's apparatus of patronage.

During the nineteenth century this attitude became less and less common, both among the bishops and among the politicians, as patronage ceased to be a part of the machinery of politics. Queen Victoria took a close personal interest in the appointment of bishops. She often disagreed with her Prime Ministers, but the disagreements generally had nothing to do with party-political affiliations.⁶ Lord Salisbury, for all his interest in Church matters, found the task of making ecclesiastical appointments very burdensome,⁷ and Asquith considered the system "in these times not only anomalous but, on paper, almost indefensible". Asquith writes that

he relied to some extent on the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but that he nevertheless "took the utmost trouble to find the best man, and, so far as was compatible with the needs and traditions of particular dioceses, to hold the balance even between the different parties in the Church."⁸

There is, however, some evidence for a supposition that in Asquith's time and for some years afterwards, known political leanings might affect, favourably or adversely, a particular clergyman's prospects of promotion. It may not be entirely due to coincidence that some of the more radically-inclined prelates of recent times have been appointed under Liberal or Labour Prime Ministers.⁹ Lord Rosebery, in pressing Dr Percival (then Headmaster of Rugby) to become Bishop of Hereford in 1895, wrote to him: "I have some reason to hope that your views and my own are, to a considerable extent, in agreement. . . . It is extremely desirable that a bishop of your opinions should be placed on the marches of Wales."¹⁰ In the same year Dr Talbot, who was also to show Liberal sympathies in the House of Lords, was appointed to Rochester; he was translated to Winchester in 1911. Charles Gore was appointed to Oxford in 1911, Dr Barnes to Birmingham in 1924 and Dr Temple to York in 1929. Gore had, however, received his first episcopal appointment, to Worcester, at the hands of a Conservative Government in 1901. The appointment occasioned some surprise, as he had just been causing the Government some embarrassment by his activities in connection with the South African war. Lord Salisbury did not allow this political consideration to interfere with what he believed to be his duty to the Church.¹¹ It should also be mentioned that William Temple's socialist leanings were not allowed to stand in the way of his translation from York to Canterbury in 1942, under a predominantly conservative coalition government. Though doubts about the wisdom of the translation were expressed in some anti-socialist quarters, Lord Halifax has written in his memoirs (*Fulness of Days*, Collins, 1957, p. 167) that it would have been "unthinkable that anyone else should be preferred to him, and to do so would have been to inflict a grave injustice on the Church at a critical juncture in her history".

The citation of these few cases, all of them before 1931, does not invalidate a general assertion that political considerations were coming to count for less and less in relation to appointments to the bishops' bench. Recent Prime Ministers appear to have relied greatly

on the advice of their patronage secretaries, who are civil servants and who can be assumed to pay great attention to the wishes of the individual diocese concerned, as indicated by the dean and chapter. They no doubt also consult the Archbishop of Canterbury of the day before advising the Prime Minister.

Bishops have long since ceased to feel any sort of obligation to come down to the House of Lords to support with their votes the Party under which they have been appointed, and there is no longer the faintest suspicion that a record of faithful voting could be a means of obtaining translation. Nevertheless, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries bishops often spoke in a partisan way on political topics, and thought that there was nothing strange in their doing so. Most of them tended to support and vote with the Conservatives. Dr Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1883 to 1896, disliked the House of Lords but thought it his duty to attend and encouraged the other bishops to do so too whenever they could.¹²

During the present century the rôle of the bishops seems to have undergone some further change. As long ago as 1909 Archbishop Davidson, recognizing the tendency for bishops to abstain more and more from political controversy, preferred not to take part in the struggle over the Finance Bill, though he wrote that he would be "sorry to seem to urge silence on any of our body if they . . . think it really expedient to say their say."¹³ In fact, five bishops spoke on the Bill, and two years later six spoke in the debates connected with the Parliament Bill. In speaking on Irish Home Rule in 1913, however, Archbishop Lang did refer to "the hesitation with which one of the spiritual Lords enters upon a discussion of a question on which Party divisions are so marked".

Now, in the middle of the century, there is less general participation by bishops in debate than there was fifty years ago. Randall Davidson's interpretation of the changing rôle of bishops has been proved correct, and the trend which he observed and encouraged has continued. With a few exceptions, bishops appear to consider that they should intervene only on appropriate occasions, usually on questions concerning moral or social welfare or education, and there seems also to be a tendency for them not, for the most part, to speak in so personal and individual a way as their predecessors of fifty years ago.¹⁴ It is rare for more than one bishop to intervene in a debate, and a bishop's speech is sometimes

regarded, rightly or wrongly, as an expression of the general opinion of the Church of England (and perhaps, in a way, of the whole of English Protestant Christianity) on a particular subject. This is particularly the case with the Archbishop of Canterbury, though there is evidence of a feeling of uneasiness lest the Archbishop should regularly be regarded as the accredited mouthpiece of the Church.¹⁵ In divisions bishops rarely vote, and they hardly ever do so when party-political questions are involved.

Although the bishops have in general withdrawn from party politics, a feeling seems to have grown up that they ought to show interest in debates on moral, educational, or social questions. But even for a debate of this type, four or five bishops may now be expected to attend where twenty might have been present fifty years ago. A sparsely-filled bishops' bench may be felt to warrant an explanation or an apology. In 1951 only one bishop was present at a debate on a motion that the children of divorced persons should be better protected by the law; in supporting the motion he expressed regret that his colleagues were "collectively occupied elsewhere".¹⁶ In 1955, when no bishops were present at a debate on prisons, strictures were expressed because "no one from this bench was here or seemed to take any interest"; in 1956, when there was another debate on the same subject, two bishops made speeches.¹⁷

By the middle 1930s it would be fair to say that with one or two exceptions the bishops had practically ceased to contribute to the ordinary proceedings of the House. The exceptions were important, however. Archbishop Lang was one of the most frequent speakers in the House, and he spoke on all manner of subjects, including, for example, many matters of principle and detail in connection with the Indian constitutional reforms. Dr Garbett, too, spoke fairly often after he had entered the House as Bishop of Southwark. After his translation to Winchester in 1932 he continued to be a fairly frequent contributor to important debates for the rest of his life. For over twenty years he was an outspoken exponent of the Christian conscience, not only on social questions, but sometimes on political questions also. During the first two years of the Labour Government of 1945, for example, he made long and important speeches on the great reforms which the Government carried through. He supported the National Health Service Bill, and called the National Insurance Bill "a measure of which any nation might be proud". He himself initiated debates on the housing shortage, on road casualties, on the

rights of minorities under international agreements, and on international control of atomic energy. He pleaded for a liberal policy towards Germany, and made other speeches on international relations.

Dr Bell, who was appointed Bishop of Chichester in 1929, has long enjoyed a special reputation as an expert on international and particularly on European and German affairs. He has spoken in many debates on these subjects, and also on defence policy, during the past twenty years. In the session of 1945-6 alone he spoke in no less than eight debates on these topics. He has not always eschewed controversy. In July 1956 he asked a Parliamentary Question (a very rare exercise for a bishop) on the deportation of a Greek priest who was said to have been engaged in subversive activities in London. The question led to some rather heated interchanges of a type more familiar in the House of Commons than in the Lords. In the debate on the Suez Canal in September 1956 he spoke very strongly against any independent British action apart from the United Nations, but abstained from voting in the division.

Dr Geoffrey Fisher, though he has spoken not infrequently since his appointment to Canterbury in 1945, tended until recently to limit his contributions to subjects which seemed to require a statement of opinion from, and on behalf of, the Church and perhaps organized Christianity in general. He has, however, often spoken vigorously on colonial policy. In 1947 he strongly supported the grant of independence to India; since then he has taken a large part in debates on Central African Federation and on Cyprus.

During 1956 Dr Fisher made a number of interventions on important political or near-political questions, which brought him rather nearer to the centre of political controversy. Soon after the introduction of Mr Macmillan's proposal to issue Premium Bonds, he seized an opportunity, in the form of a debate on a private Member's Small Lotteries and Gaming Bill, to attack, not only that Bill, but also the whole principle of the Premium Bonds, which he denounced because they would "debase the spiritual coinage of the nation at the very time when there was paramount need to restore it". In the debate of September on the Government's policy with regard to the Suez Canal he pleaded for national unity, and persuaded the Government leaders to accept a small amendment to the terms of their motion, in order that he might vote for it.¹⁸ For these rather positive interventions he was criticized in the *Spectator*

("Why he thought it necessary to vote at all is not clear"). On 1 November, in the debate following the British assault in Egypt, he expressed uneasiness about the Government's veto at the Security Council. Later, when the Lord Chancellor was defending the Government's actions, the Archbishop harried him until he admitted that the attacking force was Israel.

For the rest, the bishops have in recent years rarely gone outside the fields of moral and social welfare which fall very clearly within their special province. Many have spoken hardly at all, even on these matters. Dr Ramsey did not make his maiden speech in the House until after his appointment to York. Those bishops whose dioceses are far from London can only very rarely manage to attend at the House, and all find that most of their time is taken up with their normal episcopal duties. One of the more frequent contributors to debate has been the Bishop of Sheffield, Dr Hunter, who has made some very valuable contributions on the welfare of children and other social questions. He has, however, sometimes spoken also on broader questions of public policy.

In the successive debates on capital punishment several bishops have spoken as well as Archbishop Fisher. On the Bill of 1956 there were four speeches from the bishops' benches, all, except that of Dr Chavasse, Bishop of Rochester, favouring abolition. Bishops have also made occasional contributions on "constituency" questions. In 1955 the Bishop of Derby (Dr Rawlinson) himself initiated a debate on mining subsidence. In December 1956, when there was a debate on the Government's road construction programme, the Bishop of Carlisle spoke about the inadequacy of the roads in his diocese, and of the plans for their improvement.

Owing to the rules of the Establishment, it is occasionally necessary for a measure concerning Church government to be presented to Parliament, and this task is performed in the House of Lords by a bishop. Nowadays the House is much inclined to allow proposals of this type to go through without debate. As recently as 1926, however, there were hotly-contested battles in the House over proposals to divide dioceses; the plan to create a diocese of Shrewsbury was defeated by 61 votes to 60, with the two Archbishops and eight bishops voting in favour and two bishops against.¹⁹ It would be surprising if such a thing happened in the House of Lords of to-day.

Bishops are of course entitled to cast their votes in divisions in the House, but during the past fifty years they have become less and less inclined to do so. This is partly because divisions rarely take place nowadays except on matters which clearly concern the parties as such. From fifteen to twenty bishops voted against the Liberal Government in each of the crucial divisions in committee on Mr Birrell's Education Bill of 1906. In 1911, when the outcome of the imminent division on the Parliament Bill was in doubt, Archbishop Davidson gave influential support to Lord Lansdowne's policy of trying to prevent the Bill from being rejected. He told Lord Crewe that he had "issued a form of enquiry to the episcopal Bench. . . . Though he could not act as a Whip to get the bishops to vote, yet he would help generally as far as he could".²⁰ In the event, thirteen prelates voted with the Government and two against it. The Bill would just have been passed without the bishops' votes, but before the division took place it seemed that they might well hold the balance, as their predecessors had in fact held it in the momentous division of 1831 in which the Reform Bill was rejected. In 1913 the two Archbishops and fifteen bishops voted against the Government's Irish Home Rule Bill; Bishops Percival and Talbot voted for the Bill.

Between the wars, bishops voted in large numbers only on the Liquor (Popular Control) Bill of 1924 (thirteen for, one against), on the ecclesiastical measures just mentioned, on the Prayer Book in 1928, and on Indian constitutional reform. The participation of both Archbishops and fifteen bishops in the vote on behalf of the Indian reforms was the last instance of a substantial turnout of prelates on a political question. For the rest, it was exceedingly rare for more than one or two bishops to vote in any division. When a bishop did vote, it was more often than not in the company of the more radical element in the House, often with the Government. Conservative or National, against a group of dissatisfied right-wing Conservative peers.

Since 1945 only a few questions have brought out bishops to vote in divisions at all. In the division on capital punishment in 1948 there was one bishop on each side; in 1956, however, both Archbishops and eight bishops voted for the Bill, and one against it. Four bishops voted for the Parliament Bill of 1948 and two against it. Two each voted once against the Labour Government on amendments to the Iron and Steel Bill. In 1953 one bishop voted against

the Government on Central African Federation. In the debate on Suez Canal policy in September 1956 Dr Fisher and the Bishop of Sheffield voted with the Government, but only after the Government had satisfied certain conditions. On 1 November 1956, in the debate on the British attack on Egypt, no bishop voted, but Dr Fisher's abstention, in view of the character of his interventions in the debate, could perhaps be interpreted as an expression of hostility. In the division on Lord Hailsham's motion on commercial television in 1953, four bishops voted against the Government's plans. When these plans were embodied in a Bill, however, only the Bishop of Coventry voted against the Government on the second reading; Dr Fisher did not vote, although he had spoken in the debate. The Bishops of Bristol and Liverpool each voted against the Government four times on committee points. For the rest, in the great majority of divisions no bishop voted at all. Occasionally one bishop might be found voting on such a subject as licensing or proposed improvements to Parliament Square. In the eleven years 1945-56 there were only 21 divisions in which any bishop voted, out of a total of 193.²¹

This examination of the voting record of the bishops' bench in recent years suggests that it is unrealistic to grumble, as some commentators have done, at clerical voting in the Legislature. Only on four occasions since 1939 have more than two bishops voted in a division, and bishops have almost universally refrained from voting on party questions. In divisions in which the voting, though technically free, has mainly followed party lines, bishops have been more against the main body of the Conservative Party than with it; this has been so both on commercial television and on capital punishment.

The conclusion which emerges most strikingly from a study of the rôle of the spiritual Lords in the contemporary Upper House is that they have, as a group, arrived at an interpretation of their place in the Legislature which well accords with the needs of the times. Abstention from any sort of activity—and particularly from voting in divisions—which might lead to their being identified with any political Party has become almost a tradition; but this abstention has been accompanied by a positive readiness to state the Christian point of view on matters which are not the subject of party strife. Few would deny that the special experience and knowledge which bishops possess, particularly those who have spent large parts of

their lives in parochial work, qualify them admirably for contributing to discussions on the great social questions of the day; a study of the contributions of bishops to such debates suggests that the debates would have been the poorer without them. There may be some who believe that the bishops have become too circumspect. Josiah Wedgwood wrote in 1942 that he would like "both bishops and judges to do their duty by their country as leaders and not as servants".²² But the bishops are not alone among members of the House of Lords in showing circumspection with regard to political questions. Other members who may be regarded as specialists, the military men and the distinguished industrialists and professional men who have been given peerages, have shown a parallel tendency to keep themselves apart from party politics. (The number of temporal lords to whom Vacher's *Parliamentary Companion* ascribes no party membership has doubled in the past twenty years, and few contemporary peers of first creation, other than those who have reached the House of Lords by way of politics, belong to either party.) The conduct of party politics in the House of Lords is nowadays left mainly to the avowed politicians; the non-political peers of first creation, like the bishops, attend rarely and only speak, for the most part, in their capacity as experts in their several fields.

It has occasionally been suggested that the presence of the bishops in the House of Lords is of special use to the Conservative Party. A study of their contribution to the work of the House in the past thirty years shows how wide of the mark this suggestion is. On the rare occasions on which spiritual Lords have spoken or voted on "political" matters they have, on the whole, joined with the Left rather than the Right; arguments based on the conduct of their predecessors of a hundred years ago are of no validity in contemporary circumstances.

It remains to examine the current notion that it is "unjust" that bishops should be provided with seats in Parliament. One form of this argument claims that if Anglican bishops sit, leaders of other denominations ought to have seats also. With this point of view it is hard to quarrel. Another form is that the number of bishops with seats in the Upper House is too great. The reply to this would seem to be that, as it is rare for more than two or three of the twenty-six to be able to attend any particular debate, a reduction in the number of bishops with seats would be likely to reduce the already

small scope of the spiritual Lords' contribution; and it would be very hard indeed to argue that that contribution has in recent years been excessive in quantity. The effective modern House of Lords, in its unreformed state, consists of two main elements: some sixty or seventy "politicians", who carry on the day-to-day work, and some four hundred other members, of whom about a third are appointed members, who come to the House from time to time, some more frequently and others less so, and who speak when they have something specific to contribute. It is to this group that the bishops may be said to belong; along with the others they do much to preserve the balance which is the great advantage of the present House of Lords.

¹ This article is based on material from a chapter in a book on the House of Lords, to be published by Routledge and Kegan Paul early in 1958. I should like to express my gratitude to Canon H. E. W. Turner for much valuable advice.

² The last prelate to hold high secular office was Archbishop John Williams, who was appointed Lord Keeper in 1621, at the same time as he was made Bishop of Lincoln.

³ Archbishop Secker attended what was probably a meeting of the cabinet council as late as 1763. (Cf. E. R. Turner, *The Cabinet Council*, Vol. II, p. 80.)

⁴ A. S. Turberville, *The House of Lords in the Eighteenth Century* (O.U.P., 1927), p. 422. Cf. R. Pares, *George III and the Politicians* (O.U.P., 1953), p. 41: "The bishops were almost a laughing-stock for their subservience. They could not even stay away without exciting comment."

⁵ Cf. Cyril Garbett in *The Future of the House of Lords* (Hansard Society, 1954), pp. 96f. Dr Garbett cites two occasions in 1733 when Walpole was saved from defeat by bishops' votes. Bishops were held responsible for the defeat of Fox's India Bill in 1783. (Cf. *Memorials and Correspondence of Charles James Fox*, Vol. II, p. 220, quoted in Pares, op. cit., p. 41.)

⁶ For a full treatment of this subject, cf. G. K. A. Bell, *Randall Davidson* (O.U.P., 1938), specially at pp. 163ff.

⁷ Cf. Gwendolen Cecil, *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 194.

⁸ Earl of Oxford and Asquith, *Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. II, p. 217.

⁹ Cf. Sir W. Ivor Jennings, *Cabinet Government* (C.U.P., 1936), p. 392.

¹⁰ Quoted in William Temple, *Life of Bishop Percival* (Macmillan, 1921), p. 130.

¹¹ Cf. G. L. Prestige, *Life of Bishop Gore* (Heinemann, 1935), pp. 227f.

¹² Cf. A. C. Benson, *Life of Edward Benson*, Vol. II, p. 66.

¹³ Cf. his letter to the Bishop of Wakefield, quoted in Bell, *Randall Davidson*, p. 595. The Archbishop seems to have been more positively discouraging to some other bishops' ideas of intervening in the controversy. Mr J. G. Lockhart, in *Cosmo Gordon Lang* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), p. 362, suggests that Dr Davidson advised the bishops to take no part in the debate, and was doubtful of the wisdom of the intervention (against rejection) of his brother Archbishop, Dr Lang.

¹⁴ Cf. H. Hensley Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life* (O.U.P.), Vol. II (1943), p. 86.

¹⁵ Thus at the Bristol Diocesan Conference in May 1956 the Bishop (Dr Cockin) was asked if there was a conspiracy on the part of bishops to refrain from speaking out on things of national and international importance, if they discussed them in private and left the Archbishop of Canterbury to make public statements. The Bishop answered the question with a qualified negative. (*Manchester Guardian*, 24 May 1956.) The *Guardian's* sub-editor headed this report: "No Cabinet of Bishops".

¹⁶ H. L. Debs., 14 February 1951, Vol. 190, col. 346.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 31 July 1956, Vol. 199, col. 444.

¹⁸ H. L. Debs., 13 September 1956, Vol. 199, col. 855.

¹⁹ Cf. H. Hensley Henson, *Retrospect*, Vol. II, p. 91.

²⁰ J. Pope-Hennessy, *Lord Crewe* (Constable, 1955), pp. 125f. From Dr Bell's more detailed account (*Randall Davidson*, pp. 627f.) however, it is clear that the Archbishop was in great doubt as to whether he ought to vote at all and that he only finally decided to vote at the very last minute, when it seemed that the diehards might probably be in the majority.

²¹ This figure of participation in 12% of the divisions shows a considerable change even from the habits of the 1920s. In 1926 one or more bishops voted in each of eleven divisions, out of a total of twenty-nine in the session.

²² In a letter to Lord Macmillan, quoted in C. V. Wedgwood, *The Last of the Radicals* (Jonathan Cape, 1951), p. 238.

G. E. MOORE AND THE PROBLEM OF UNIVERSALS

LESLIE PAUL

PROFESSOR emeritus George Edward Moore, that modest and retiring "grand old man" of English philosophy, celebrates his eighty-fourth birthday this year. His eightieth birthday, in 1953, was marked by the publication of *Some Main Problems of Philosophy*¹ which is in some ways a masterpiece, and a rather neglected one, and about that I will say something presently. A great and equally venerable contemporary of Moore's, Bertrand Russell, talking in the B.B.C.'s Home Service a short time ago about his Cambridge days in the 1890s, spoke of how he met G. E. Moore in his, Moore's, first year at the University, and found that he fulfilled Russell's idea of genius. "He was in those days beautiful and slim, with a look almost of inspiration, and with an intellect as deeply passionate as Spinoza's. He had a kind of exquisite purity. I have never but once succeeded in making him tell a lie, and that was by a subterfuge. 'Moore,' I said, 'do you always speak the truth?' 'No', he replied. I believe this to be the only lie he has ever told."

The writings and personality of Bertrand Russell are known all over the world. His influence on British philosophy in the last half century has been incalculable. Yet it is probably true that the influence of G. E. Moore has been even greater still, and deservedly so. It was Moore who imparted a new direction to English philosophy by the essay he contributed to *Mind* in 1903 on "The Refutation of Idealism". That new direction is still, in general terms, I think we can say, the dominating one, or at least an unexpended one. But his writings are scant and are mostly in the philosophical journals, and so he has escaped the rôle of public sage and popular oracle. He has published four books only: they are two slight but important works on ethics, a collection of essays and addresses, and the last book, *Some Main Problems of Philosophy*, which is by far

¹ Allen and Unwin, 1953.

his greatest and most systematic work, though it consists of lectures delivered over forty-four years ago at Morley College. Laziness as well as modesty seems to be at the root of Moore's disinclination to write or to print. He tells against himself somewhere the story that about the time he was delivering the lectures now published he was asked to review an important work of philosophy for the journal *Mind*. He found that it raised questions so fundamental that he felt he could not review it, in all honesty, until he had cleared them up. At the end of four years the review was still undelivered. The patience of the editor of *Mind* at last exhausted, he approached Bertrand Russell who, typically, produced a review promptly and efficiently. This, Moore admits, is the most scandalous instance of his own dilatoriness.

Moore was born in 1873 in a South London suburb and was educated at a famous nearby school, Dulwich College. His father was a retired doctor, his eldest brother the poet and critic, Thomas Sturge Moore. Apart from a severe phase of evangelistic fervour at the age of twelve, when he forced himself against his inclinations to hand out religious tracts on a seaside promenade, his boyhood was smooth and untroubled. His education was entirely classical, and it was as a classics scholar (and incidentally an agnostic) that he went up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1892. It was there, under the influence of Bertrand Russell, that he discovered his philosophical interests and switched from classics to moral sciences. His life thereafter was set in philosophical academic circles. He received a Trinity Fellowship, then spent seven years away from Cambridge, but returned in 1911 and stayed there teaching for twenty-eight years, in fact until his retirement from the chair of philosophy in 1939.

When Moore began to discuss philosophical problems with Bertrand Russell and others in the quiet Cambridge nights of long ago, the dominant trend of thought was idealist. English philosophy had digested Kant and was in process of digesting Hegel, and F. H. Bradley had just published his epoch-making discussion of the Absolute entitled *Appearance and Reality*. The teachings of such idealists as McTaggart and Bradley were moulding contemporary opinion, and Russell and Moore were themselves enthusiastic followers of these great men. Yet Russell and Moore were both due to break away, each in his own manner: Russell by way of mathematics and logic to become a philosopher who, in strictly

empirical manner, cast doubt on the value of metaphysics, and sought to subordinate philosophy to science; and Moore made, while still a fellow of Trinity, that most incisive attack on idealism entitled "The Refutation of Idealism" to which I have already referred.

If I speak about this essay and its influence for a moment or two it will cast light upon the kind of approach which Moore used in his last book, an approach very typical of him. English idealism of the Hegelian school had been without influence upon science, and was alien to it. The natural sciences everywhere at the turn of the century insisted, as of course they do now, upon the objective reality and independence of matter. Idealism doubted this objective reality: idealists took for granted the superiority of the subject or consciousness, and the dependence of the object upon it. The material object, known only through sense-experience, was probably nothing *but* sense experience. That was a position at which empiricist philosophers like Bishop Berkeley had also arrived. If science and philosophy, and common sense and philosophy were not to be completely estranged, here was a position on which, sooner or later, an attack had to be made. Moore began his refutation with just this point—the conflict between commonsense and idealism. According to idealism, Moore wrote, "the universe is very different from what it seems" and "it has quite a large number of properties which it does not seem to have". Commonsense and idealism part company, for though to commonsense tables and chairs appear one sort of thing, and our experiences of our minds another sort of thing, idealism argues that fundamentally they are the same sort of thing.

To make clear what was being asserted by idealists, and to demonstrate how illegitimate were their assertions, Moore analysed the phrase made familiar by Bishop Berkeley as long ago as the eighteenth century—"esse is *percipi*". Is it the case, Moore asked, that when we assert that *esse* is *percipi* that the copula, the "is", means that there is absolute identity between *esse* and *percipi*, that they are interchangeable terms? If so, in saying "*esse* is *percipi*", one would be simply defining a word by its synonym, and there would be little point in making the statement. It would be tautological. But, he argued, what is really being asserted is not that *esse* is *percipi* in the sense that one is the other, but rather that each of these words is being used to denote a distinct term, and that there

is a necessary relation between them. However, the idealist, Moore said, all along failed to see this—he had failed to see, for example, that between yellow and the *sensation* of yellow there really is a difference. If yellow and the sensation of yellow *are* identical, really *identical*, then there is no difference between yellow and experience. The experience of yellow is the same as yellow. But if experience of yellow is the same as yellow, how is it possible to know that there is such a thing as experience? And what then of the experience of *green*? Again, sensation of *blue* differs from sensation of *green*. But they are both sensations (experiences). What have they in common in being sensations, since the content is so different? Moore argued that the common denominator of the two experiences is consciousness. Blue and green are not themselves consciousness—that would be absurd—they are both the *experience* of consciousness. This analysis makes it possible to separate consciousness from the *experience* of consciousness, and to say that both exist, and that there is no absolute identity between *esse* and *percipi*.

Of course, it sounds somewhat obvious when put in Moore's terms, yet the astonishing thing is that Moore was actually exposing a subtlety which had escaped his learned predecessors. He was exposing the confusion which had arisen because the act of perception had not been clearly enough distinguished from the content of perception. Perceiving had not been sufficiently differentiated from the *what* which was perceived. And thereafter no idealist philosopher could ignore the criticism. Moore did not bring idealist philosophy to an immediate end by this criticism, but he robbed it of the intellectual mastery it had exercised over philosophical intelligences.

By this route he became the defender of the position adopted by commonsense. Commonsense says that material objects are real, and so are minds, and they are separate. But though Moore has never really embarked on any great work of metaphysics to show why this should be so, he has defended the fact that they are so with a subtlety and skill scholastic in its thoroughness. *Some Main Problems of Philosophy*, so modestly proffered to the world, and scathingly criticized by Moore himself in footnotes and the appendix, reveals the same inexhaustible critical capacity devoted to the upholding of a commonsense or realist philosophy against idealist, materialist, and pragmatist positions.

This great work sets out to demonstrate that there are four different kinds of constituents of the universe, and that we have knowledge of them all, directly or indirectly. These four are, material objects, minds, truths or facts, universals. He does not define it himself in quite this way, for he includes "minds" and "material object" under the single term "particulars". But that is nevertheless what he is asserting—that material objects exist independently of our minds (and *vice versa*); that truths or facts exist independently of our reason and are not created by our "discovery" of them; that universals do exist also, again independently of our minds.

When Moore speaks of universals, he is thinking of those "general ideas" or "abstract ideas" which have so often been under fire in English philosophy. Many English philosophers—empiricists for the most part—have decided that such things do not exist, or are merely the creation of the mind. As if, for instance, Moore points out, there cannot have been two things in the universe until some mind had created the number two, for two is, of course, a universal, or abstract idea, like whiteness, or squareness, or human nature.

As the debate about universals has confused and complicated English philosophical thought for many a century, and no doubt will continue to do so, it is worth quoting the summary which Moore makes towards the end of the book of the principles he hopes he has established. He writes: "There is, of course, a psychological process called 'abstraction' and people constantly speak, I think, as if universals were a product of this process, and as if that were how they should be defined. But the true account of the matter seems to be this. Namely, the process of abstraction is a process by which we become aware of universals. It is our *awareness* of them which is a product of the process; not the universals themselves. And, instead of its being possible to define universals as products of the process of abstraction, it is, so far as I can see, only possible to define abstraction by reference to universals: what we mean by abstractions is just the process by which we first learn to distinguish universals, and there is no other way of defining it."

Philosophies of ethics have had to face special difficulties in the last century. If they were launched from the standpoint of the idealist or absolutist philosopher, then they had to grapple with the contradiction of the presence of evil within what should be a

perfect Absolute, and they often in consequence dismissed evil as a form of good. If they sprang from empiricist premisses then they found it difficult to distinguish good from what gave one pleasure, and evil from what gave one pain. The pragmatist, on the other hand, tried to define good by reference to what worked, what was useful—and then the evolutionary philosopher had the impossible task of reconciling that which being good in an evolutionary sense was clearly evil in a personal sense. By all these accounts good was always something other than itself. Moore, in his works on ethics, asserted quite simply that it was *itself*. Good was intrinsic: good was simply good: it was a quality or property as native to a thing as yellow to the buttercup or round to the ball.

In *Some Main Problems of Philosophy* he defended truth by much the same kind of argument. Truth is not just a product of minds: it is indefensible to argue that there was no truth in the universe until minds discovered it. No, when we say that a belief is true, we mean that there is some fact in the universe to which the belief refers which would not exist if the belief were false. It is almost impossible to demonstrate the meticulous and skilful but prolix dissection he makes of “what we mean when we say certain things” which leads him to that conclusion, for the argument is so closely knit that many a time one has to pause and re-read crucial passages. But Moore shows that when we believe something, we are making a proposition about the nature or constituents of the universe—though we must be careful not to imagine that all propositions are in the form of words—and this proposition is the *object* of our belief. Of course, there may be no truth to correspond to the *object* there: in that case the belief, though truly made, is false as to fact, and is therefore a false belief. In other words, the *act* of belief has to be distinguished from the *object* of the belief. In fact, Moore revealed a distinction rather like that which he makes between *esse* and *percipi*. There is an act of perceiving, and the object is perceived. Similarly, there is an act of belief, and there is the *what* which is believed. The intensity or fixity of a belief has nothing to do with its truth, which can be determined only by reference to what is, in fact, objectively true—that is to say, has *being* independent of the act of belief.

“Suppose, for instance, that I believe that lions exist,” Moore wrote, “and that this belief is true. There *is* in this case, because the belief is true, a fact having the name ‘that lions exist’, but my belief

does not consist in a relation between me and that fact, nor between me and any other fact of the same name. The fact that my belief is true does, of course imply that there is a relation between me and that fact. But it is the *truth* of the belief which consists in that relation: the belief itself does *not* consist in it."

True acts of *belief*, he said, are of course entirely dependent on the mind. It is the mind that makes them. But what it makes them about are the facts of the Universe and about these it can be right or wrong. But the truth, which is not just an act of belief, but the fact to which the act of belief refers, is independent of the mind and exists without it, and is therefore eternally and absolutely true despite any errors we make about it.

Moore's method, as can be seen from these brief accounts of his book, is critical and analytical in the extreme. *Some Main Problems of Philosophy* is in fact extremely contemporary in technique despite the fact that it consists of the texts of lectures delivered more than forty years ago. Through it one glimpses more clearly the influence Moore must have had, during a lifetime of teaching, upon the younger generation of philosophers now in the saddle—and thereby upon the growth of logical positivism and suchlike disciplines.

Yet, though his thought has grown exceedingly subtle, and the wrist that works the scalpel more supple, his main position appears not to have altered much across the years. There are material objects, he affirms, they occupy positions in space; they are external to us. There are minds which know these objects and each other indirectly through data given to the senses. These minds also, by processes which include those of abstraction or the discovery of universals, grasp at truths or facts about the constituents of the universe and their relations, including truths about minds and material objects and the ways in which they behave. They make propositions, or arrive at beliefs about these things. But they can be wrong or mistaken, for the truth is not that which is created by the individual mind, but is an ultimate constituent of the universe itself. We discover, as best we can, truths already there.

It is quite a remarkable position to have grown out of the rejection of idealism, and by way of the exercise of an analytical technique. It is one which no one has completely overthrown since Moore began to expound it, and the repercussions of it are going to be with us for a very long time.

CORRESPONDENCE

MYTH

SIR,—During the last few years the word “myth” has been used with increasing frequency, more especially perhaps in our religious publications. Used carefully, and with an awareness of its implications, the word is a very useful one; but it should be remembered that “myth”, to many, simply and crudely means something which is not true. This makes it a dangerous word to use when addressing a mixed audience or congregation, and we—especially the clergy—should use it only with great care. In your current issue there is a reference to the Tristan myth: in our daily papers lately we have seen the headlines, the Stalin myth. Both of these we can understand, although in the first instance “legend” might be a better word; but what are we to make of “The Christian Myth” which appeared in a well-known weekly about a month ago? The Christian Myth! With as much truth, and (considering the modern neo-Darwin theories) with as much justification, we could speak of the myth of Evolution. Indeed, considering that every text-book of Science must be radically revised at least once every twenty years, we might even speak of the Science myth.

Would it not be possible for you—perhaps in one of your Editorials—to give some guidance concerning the correct use of this important and dangerous little word?

Stone Cottage,
Mare Hill,
Pulborough,
Sussex.

JOHN SEARLE

DOES GOD SUFFER?

Sir,—Dr C. S. Lewis has written that the devil sends errors into the world in pairs, so that in fleeing from one we shall fall into the other. Mr Owen (*C.Q.R.*, Vol. CLVIII, pp. 176ff.) sounds a timely warning against the all too familiar picture of a deity victimized perennially by the sins and follies of his creatures. But his metaphysics commit him to the view that though God sympathizes with us as a dramatist must with the characters in his play, he has no sufferings of his own at all. His perfection does not permit him even the most fleeting interruption of his eternal bliss. As Studdert Kennedy would ask, “Whose idea of perfection is that?” As for the argument that because the deity has no bodily

organism therefore he cannot suffer, one might as well allege that as God has no physical ears therefore he cannot hear. About which the psalmist had something pertinent to say.

However, "Cui bono?" If these reasonings are important they are important not only to the don in his den, but to the people in the pew. The hardest part of theology is the translation of the language of the schools into forms understood of the people. When the scholars have done their work the preacher's ordeal of interpretation begins. When I said this to the late Dr Spencer Leeson, that great and scholarly Bishop replied with deep feeling, "I know, and the language of the schools does not get any simpler, does it?" I have therefore tried to illustrate Dr A. E. Taylor's metaphysics (cited *C.Q.R.*, p. 182, ref. 6) sentence by sentence, as follows, in order to see what comes out of them:

(i) A man prevented by circumstances beyond his control from jumping into a pit, is not as powerful as he should be, and is then not a man in our sense of the word.

(ii) But a man who owing to something in his own nature, refrains from jumping into a pit, must be either defective or not defective.

(iii) In the former case (if hindered by a defect of nature) then he is still not-a-man in our sense of the word at all.

(iv) In the latter case (i.e. when hesitation is not due to a defect) there is no sense in calling his failure to jump a limitation. What would be a limitation would be if he could not stop himself jumping into the pit if he chose to refrain.

But this is where we came in. Unless I am mistaken, all that we have established is that a man or deity who cannot limit himself if he sees any point (by the way, can he see without eyes?) in doing so is a very limited sort of deity; and a man or deity who can limit himself is not limited. One is sorely tempted to hazard that there is nothing which metaphysics can say about the divine Being, his sovereignty and freedom, which scripture does not say better: "He drew me out of the horrible pit, out of the miry clay". But he descended into the horrible pit in order to do it. Metaphysics seem to say that the perfection of God requires his immunity to any suffering of his own. Scripture replies that his perfection consists in voluntary acceptance of the suffering and then in his sovereign love and power transforming every loss into a greater gain. "God cannot do the impossible; for the impossible is what God cannot do. He cannot exist and not exist" (Raymond Chapman, *C.Q.R.*, Vol. CLVII, p. 444). Can he love and not suffer? Can he suffer and not prevail? This is the real question. No one supposes, or should suppose, that sin and suffering any more than time and space are eternal. But neither should we question that the sufferings of God in Christ on the Cross are God's own sovereign sufferings—even to the point of dereliction—any more than the glory to which he will raise us up is real glory and everlasting joy. This, I take it, is what our great contemporary theologians mean, and they do well to emphasize it.

St John's Vicarage,
Southend-on-Sea.

G. W. C. THOMAS

REVIEWS

THE SUFFERING SERVANT

THE SERVANT OF GOD. By W. ZIMMERLI and J. JEREMIAS. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

IN THIS volume of about 100 pages we are given a translation of the article *Pais Theou* from Kittel's *Wörterbuch*. Those who are familiar with the latter need not be told that these articles, even if lengthy, do not aspire to the status of a book. The writers' aim is rather to provide a full lexical survey and to combine this with a theological analysis. It is, therefore, useless to look for a central argument or even a climax. The article under discussion is first-rate and should be especially useful for students and discussion-groups. Zimmerli's systematic examination of the profane and religious usage of the title '*Ebed*' may well serve as an example of how this kind of work is best carried out. The footnotes, if taken up, would take the student to the very heart of Old Testament scholarship. The section on the Suffering Servant will probably attract most readers because of the controversial aspect of the problems. Zimmerli (like Mowinckel) stresses the "prophetic basis" of the Servant's kingly and redemptive actions, without perhaps giving due weight to the eschatological setting in Deutero-Isaiah.

The short section on Translations in the LXX is rewarding, if only as evidence for the fact that the whole relationship between MT and LXX is highly problematical. The really invaluable part of the work, however, is found in Section III: *Pais Theou* in late Judaism in the period after the LXX. These data are notoriously difficult to come by, and many a student or preacher has reached a deadlock in his attempts to find the answer to such questions as "What did the Jews themselves make of Isaiah 52-53?" or "How did Christianity affect Jewish exegesis?" It will astonish most readers to be told that Jeremias (as against Mowinckel) comes to the conclusion that "the connexion of Isa. 53 with the Messiah was from pre-Christian days so firmly and exclusively held by Palestinian Judaism that the application of this chapter to the expiatory death of the righteous was automatically excluded from consideration" (p. 76). The evidence for this and for the whole complex tradition is beautifully set out and supported by references to learned discussions. Yet the main theme is never lost but clearly kept in view.

Jeremias leads the reader straight on to the New Testament. This discussion is in itself of outstanding interest, but what renders it really important at the present moment of New Testament debate is the controversial topic of the relevance of the '*Ebed-Yahweh*' tradition to

the primitive Christian Kerugma. Jeremias pinpoints the problem by asking and answering the key question: "Can Jesus have known himself to be the Servant of God?" He concedes that the evidence is not unequivocal, that many of the passages containing quotations from Deutero-Isaiah are "wholly or in part the work of the church". Yet a more thorough investigation of the texts establishes the authenticity of these references of Jesus to himself as the 'Ebed. The "bedrock of the tradition" in Mark shows that Jesus reckoned with the possibility of a violent death and that he linked this expectation with the predictions of redemption through royal suffering: these are not shaped *ex eventu* nor do they bear traces of Hellenistic colouring. The Eucharistic words with the decisive *hyper pollon* establish a focal point of contact with Isa. 53. But how is one to explain the fact that "the number of texts in which Jesus relates Isa. 53 to himself is not great and that they are altogether absent in the *logia* peculiar to Matthew and Luke?" In his answer Jeremias will probably stimulate or shock his readers into further reflexion: "Jesus only allowed himself to be known as the servant in his esoteric and not in his public preaching. Only to his disciples did he unveil the mystery that he viewed the fulfilment of Isa. 53 as his God-appointed task. . . ." Enough has been said to recommend this Study for painstaking scrutiny and rewarding preaching.

U. E. SIMON

THE SCROLLS DATED

JEWISH APOCALYPTIC AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. By H. H. ROWLEY. Athlone Press. 4s.

IN THIS Ethel M. Wood Lecture, delivered before the University of London last March, Dr Rowley carries the discussion on the scrolls a stage nearer decision. He thinks they were deposited in the caves shortly before A.D. 70, and that the Qumran community, to whom they belonged, had been founded about the end of the second century B.C. The Teacher of Righteousness, who looms so large in this literature, Rowley takes to be a real person, not merely a "right expounder" (i.e. of the scriptures), who lived in the early part of the second century. The Messianic Age was expected forty years after his death, and as it had not yet appeared the literature containing the suggestion cannot be dated later than the third quarter of the second century.

Such a conclusion invites a comparison of the "messianic and apocalyptic thought of the scrolls with the events and writings of the second century", and to that task the lecture is devoted. Dr Rowley has no use for any theory that identifies the Teacher of Righteousness with the Messiah or suggests that he is expected to rise from the dead. Indeed the more common view adumbrated in this literature appears to be that

there will be two Messiahs, one regal, the other priestly. That at any rate is the view of the Zadokite work, discovered in Cairo, which on every count must be reckoned as belonging to the same category as the scrolls. The Manual of Discipline, in establishing the protocol for the Messianic Banquet, takes care that the ecclesiastical Messiah shall have precedence over the civil.

A point of contrast with the New Testament is the fact that the Battle Scroll (or "War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness") revels in the thought that the way for the Messianic Kingdom will be prepared by forty years of war—all highly idealized of course, but none the less blood-thirsty. We are grateful to Dr Rowley for helping us to sane and balanced views in this controversy.

W.W.

ST MARK'S VIEW OF HISTORY

THE PROBLEM OF HISTORY IN MARK. By JAMES M. ROBINSON. S.C.M. Press. 8s.

THIS is no. 21 in the invaluable series of "Studies in Biblical Theology". To have so many first-hand theses published at a price that brings them within the reach of the "poor" student is one of the unexpected boons of our modern way of life. The present volume is one of the best of the series. It must have amply deserved the prize it won from the Christian Research Foundation.

It begins by dismissing as inadequate the various theories hitherto held—the objective historical view of the Liberal Protestants of the nineteenth century, the sharp reaction to a view of non-historical theology at the turn of the century, the mythological view of Bultmann and company, even what is called "the contemporary trend" as represented by a view of history theologically understood.

In their place is set up the thesis that St Mark saw the life of Christ as an element in the internecine struggle between God and Satan. This was no mere episode in the empyrean of the eternal warfare between good and evil. It was actually carried on in time and space in the person of Jesus. The chief witness to this struggle is the long list of exorcisms, in which occur what one might call the hand-to-hand encounters. These could be paralleled by Jewish and Pagan exorcism stories, but the distinctive note of the Marcan presentation is that they "depict a cosmic struggle to inaugurate the eschatological reign of God".

The struggle is continued in the debates between Jesus and his opponents. As it had been inaugurated in the baptism and temptation and revealed openly in the exorcism, so Jesus makes it his business to set the points disputed between himself and the scribes in this particular light. It is not only when they are arguing whether he performed his

miracles by demonic power, but in the discussions on blasphemy, on the Sabbath, on fasting, that Jesus is at pains to "get the record straight" and make clear the true nature of their difference.

Not only so, but it can be deduced from Mark's handling of the record that he believed that the same struggle was still going on in his own day. True, the place of Jesus was now taken by the Church. But the struggle that had been going on during the thirty years that had intervened since Jesus' death was still the same struggle, and it was therefore easy for Mark and his readers to understand the life of Jesus in that light.

All this is admirable. Dr Robinson is on less sure ground when he begins to estimate the evangelist's view of time. We are not clear about the distinction he draws between "the present eschatological existence" and the new aeon. Apparently he identifies the new aeon with the apocalyptic "world to come", and puts that outside history while regarding the "present eschatological existence" as within history. We are glad that he has exposed the confusion in Bultmann's identification of the apocalyptic view of the end of history with the Christian understanding of the present, but we think that his own language needs a little clarification. We suggest that there are in the view of Mark and other N.T. writers three different "worlds" or "ages": the world that now is (that is the world of the old order which is doomed to destruction), the world to come (that is the aeon that has already dawned in Christ), and the world without end (that is the glorious future when Christ will have handed over his Kingdom and time will be no more). Confusion arises because the ages are not in a single line: they are, so to speak, in echelon but with the parallel lines to some extent overlapping.

With the author's summing up we shall agree wholeheartedly. "Jesus and the Spirit are not aloof from history, but rather enter history and create history; but they are not immune forces which develop out of the present evil aeon as its potentiality. Rather, they must 'come' from heaven at a certain time and place, not as the perfection of the present evil aeon, but as the beginning of its end."

W.W.

THE TRANSFIGURATION

THE BRIGHT CLOUD. By J. R. MACPHAIL. Oxford University Press. 15s.

MR MACPHAIL has written an interesting book about the Bible for the "ordinary layman" who wants to understand theology better. Now theology necessarily implies that, in spite of all the diversity, differences, and even contradictions that can be found within the Bible, there must be a unity, a thread which runs right through from Genesis to Revelation, linking all the books and showing their true significance. For

Mr Macphail, and no Christian would disagree with him, this link is the life and person of Jesus Christ. But Mr Macphail goes further, and here he will carry fewer with him, when he declares that the true significance of the life and teaching of Jesus Christ can be seen most clearly at the Transfiguration. In Jesus overshadowed by "the Bright Cloud", we see him as truly man with his feet firmly set on our earth, his life a part of history. Yet in that incident, his inner, mysterious otherness is also plain, and thereby his Godhead is revealed.

So, after an opening chapter on the meaning of the Transfiguration, Mr Macphail goes on to examine the story of the early Church as recounted in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of St Paul. Then we are given a rapid survey of the Old Testament to help us to understand why Paul came to think and believe as he did. This section of the book provides a good introduction to the meaning of the Old Testament under the three headings, Election, Mission, Promise. Then the Gospels are examined. Two, St Mark and St John, are examined in detail. St John comes last because, although he never mentions the Transfiguration, his whole gospel is "a perpetual theophany". (These words are quoted by Mr Macphail from Loisy.) So the purpose of the Bible is to teach us that that unity between the Father and the Son which we see in the Transfiguration, can become the possession of all believers.

This book gives a very useful summary of the theology of the Bible but its very success in this respect means that for most of it we lose sight of the Transfiguration. Surely to look for the Transfiguration in every part of the Bible is to seek something that is just not there. The chapter on St Paul and the early Church is accurately entitled, "Witnesses of the Resurrection", and it is surely the Resurrection rather than the Transfiguration that gives us the key to the Bible. The Synoptic Gospels, indeed, show us that the Transfiguration was a turning point in our Lord's ministry, but was it, until after the Resurrection, anything more than a puzzling enigma to the disciples? Equally, must not the modern disciple come to the Transfiguration through the Resurrection if he is to find in it anything more than the wild fancies of uneducated, excitable men or New Testament midrash?

However, Mr Macphail's book should prove a helpful introduction to Biblical theology, though one feels that the "ordinary layman" will find such words as "existential" and "eschatology" rather strong meat.

J. ROBINSON

THE APOCALYPSE

THE BOOK OF REVELATION. Translated by J. B. PHILLIPS. Geoffrey Bles. 9s. 6d.

WITH this book the Reverend J. B. Phillips completes his translation into contemporary English of the Books of the New Testament. It is to be hoped that before long the whole New Testament may be published in this translation in one volume. Until that happens many readers will find this slender book of some seventy-five pages expensive to purchase.

The publication of the book of Revelation as a separate and final book may also give a false impression that it is a pendant to the rest of the New Testament. The strong pastoral concern and the light thrown on the situation in the early Church make the book of Revelation a definite part of the whole New Testament, and throughout its strange imagery there is a disclosure of the Lord of History which makes the book relevant to the present age. Yet the book has a unique character in the Bible, and without some knowledge of apocalyptic literature it is not easy for the plain man to understand. In a foreword Mr Phillips has some valuable comments to make upon the problems both of the book itself and of translation of it. A book so filled with visions and symbols seems to call for a translation with certain archaisms, and the more modern and clear the English so much the more does it seem difficult to convey the mystery. It is rare, however, for people to read the book of Revelation as a whole. They select attractive passages and ignore the rest. What Mr Phillips can do is to persuade people to read the book through as a whole and thus to enter into something of its wide sweep and profound message. The Bishop of Chichester, in commending this translation, mentions the "aptness and frequency of the sub-titles with which the different sections are introduced". In this way Mr Phillips indicates the pattern which is to be discerned within the book and thus enables the reader to enter more fully into the heart and mind of St John the Divine.

Mr Phillips has had to meet some baffling problems. Familiar words disappear and new ones are introduced, not always for the better. "Which was and is and is to come" in 4. 8 is changed to "Who was and Who is and Who is coming". In 1. 8 "Alpha and Omega" is left untranslated. In 12. 18 we read, "There rose out of the sea an Animal". But the word "Animal" does not carry the awe-inspiring effect of the A.V.: "And I saw a beast rise up out of the sea". In 21. 20 Mr Phillips uses a very unfamiliar word "zirkon" in the list of jewels where the words "jacinth" or "sapphire" are more familiar. But some passages spring to new life. In 18. 3 the A.V. has "For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication" for which Mr Phillips has "have drunk the wine of her passionate unfaithfulness". His sub-title "The Gorgeous Mother of Evil" makes a very modern introduction to Chapter 17. By flashes of imagination in such ways as these Mr Phillips makes his translation very vivid. Fortunately he has been courageous

enough not to be tied to pedestrian exactness, for the Greek is very incoherent at many points. He himself recognizes that the writer "is stirring with a kind of surrealistic artistry the vastnesses of our subconscious minds". If Mr Phillips has not fully succeeded in translating what he calls this celestial poetry into modern prose it is due to the fact that the book calls for poetry. But such a translation as this should help many to a new understanding of this strange book, so filled with confident hope.

MARCUS KNIGHT

THE ATONEMENT

THE CROSS OF CHRIST. By VINCENT TAYLOR. Macmillan. 10s. 6d.

THIS is a most useful little book, written in simple but excellent English which, although it contains little more than a hundred pages on one of the most important and difficult subjects, reveals scholarship and a mine of information. The educated layman and theological student will read it with profit and come to it again and again.

The book consists of eight public lectures delivered by Dr Taylor in an American University to professors, students, and the general public interested in religious subjects.

The first lecture discusses "The Cross as Eternal and as an Event in Time". This is the measure of its importance. All that follows is essentially the teaching of the New Testament, for our author "holds that the Scriptures are the primary source of Christian doctrine: a view which is held by every part of the Christian Church". Textual, literary, and historical criticism have a contribution to make, but Scripture is "the medium of divine revelation". Our study is confined almost exclusively to the New Testament and the primitive Church.

The second lecture deals with "The Cross as Jesus Himself saw it": "He never speaks of appeasing the anger of God, of placating Him and causing Him to be gracious to sinners. But He does use sacrificial ideas as a thought mould." It is in this context of thought that the Lord's Supper is to be understood.

Then follow two lectures on the teaching of St Paul: "The meaning of the Cross" and "The Cross in Christian experience". Among the primitive ideas connected with the Cross which the Apostle adopts are the "vicarious, representative, and sacrificial aspects; with its fruits in the moral and the spiritual life. . . But", says our author, "St Paul is not a formal theologian, but a poet and a rhapsodist. Yet beneath all his deep feeling there is a keen and scintillating mind, which challenges his readers by the greatness of his thought." His key word is "Reconciliation". Then follows the contribution of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the teaching of St John.

In later thought four main groups of theories are considered. The oldest is the "Ransom Theory", which held sway for a thousand years; but in the hands of some of the Fathers, it assumed such forms as to appear to modern ears almost blasphemous. Then came the "Satisfaction Theory" put forward by Anselm in the eleventh century. The third was the "Revelation" or "Moral Influence Theory" of the twelfth century; to be followed by the "Forensic Theory" of the Reformers and their successors.

Next follows a more detailed account of modern theories of the Atonement, with a very helpful criticism of the most important works and their authors; but this is confined to the period between 1856 and 1935. Such memorable names as McLeod Campbell, R. C. Moberly, H. Bushnell, R. W. Dale, and Scott Lidgett come under review. The busy reader will be grateful for this analysis.

The last chapter is an attempt by our author "to give a modern presentation of the doctrine of the Atonement". Scripture is the touchstone of faith, and is in harmony with the mind of the Church, as reflected in her teaching and worship. It is suggested that "Reconciliation" is the best term to describe the divine purpose as it includes all that is meant by redemption and forgiveness, with the added merit of describing the personal relationship with God. So much thought is packed into so little space that it cannot be described in a few words.

Dr Taylor is a scholar, but he suggests that all the greatest theologians were preachers, and himself is perhaps more anxious to convert than criticize or controvert. There is an excellent index of Scripture quotations.

R. F. WRIGHT

SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY

THE THEOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS. By DONALD M. BAILLIE. Faber and Faber. 16s.

SACRAMENTS AND WORSHIP. Edited with commentary by PAUL F. PALMER, S.J. Longmans. 15s.

DR D. M. BAILLIE'S posthumously published lectures on the theology of the Sacraments, to which his brother Dr John Baillie has written a moving biographical introduction, provide as useful an account as one could desire of the outlook of a modern high-church Calvinist theologian. And it is very high-church indeed. The objective efficacy of baptism, the real presence in the Eucharist, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, all these are defended vigorously and constructively in a way which, one imagines, would be less than acceptable in many Protestant circles. This book goes a long way towards solving that elusive but pressing

question: what is the real difference between Catholicism and Protestantism?—a question which is the more perplexing because any attempt from either side to produce an answer is met with scandalized protests and accusations of misrepresentation from the other. From Baillie's own account it would appear that the fundamental difference lies in a region anterior to that of the doctrine of the Church and the Sacraments, and consists in a radical divergence about the nature of the Incarnation itself, which affects all subsequent questions of theology.

I do not think that any Catholic theologian would be prepared, as Baillie is, to describe the Incarnation as a "historical episode",¹ or to write as follows:

If we are to work out soundly the relation of the Church and Sacraments to the historic incarnation, we must take seriously the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit. This doctrine is wholly dependent on the fact of the historic incarnation of God on earth, but it is also wholly bound up with the idea that *the incarnation did not go on for ever, but came to an end*, and that since then the divine Presence is with us in a new way through the Holy Spirit working in the Church through Word and sacraments.²

Admittedly, the force of this assertion is somewhat mitigated by the statement that "if Christ is still incarnate, he is not incarnate on earth but in heaven, in the sense that he is still man", but this, we are told, "would lead not to the idea that the Church is a continuation or extension of the incarnation on earth but rather to the idea that we are now living in an era when *the incarnate life is no longer here but in heaven*."³ The antithesis "not here but in heaven" (compare the "in heaven and not here" of the "Black Rubric") would seem to rest on a somewhat crudely geometrical view of the heavenly realm, but it is good Calvinism; and it is thoroughly consistent with the exposition which Baillie gives later on of the Eucharistic presence.⁴ We should expect it to go with a repudiation of any doctrine of "apostolic succession"; nevertheless, while Baillie rejects the "pipe-line" view as involving an impersonal view of grace, he writes:

It is of the essence of the Christian sacraments that they could not have existed but for the historical incarnation. They have continuity with it, they point straight back to it, they can only be celebrated in the redeemed community which it created, and *only by those who within that community have been set apart in a succession which connects us through the ages with the origins of our religion*.⁵

while he tells us that "if we are to be at all true to the New Testament, we must make this continuity, this extension of the Incarnation, wholly dependent on the Word and Spirit".⁶ I think many Catholics will feel that Baillie's insistence on the necessity of a

¹ *The Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 61.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 65 (my italics).

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 63-4 (my italics).

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 97f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 66 (italics mine).

⁶ *Ibid.*

ministerial succession, combined as it is with a denial that Christ is in any true sense incarnate in the Church, suggests something far more legalistic and mechanical than anything that any Catholic theologian has ever taught. And here we may note that Calvin's doctrine of the Eucharistic presence, as expounded by Baillie,⁷ seems to have one thing at least in common with St Thomas's doctrine of transubstantiation, in that both of them look upon the presence as not merely *supernatural* but as strictly *miraculous*. Perhaps we have here one of the many cases in which Protestantism has acquired an unrecognized legacy from medieval Catholicism. However, there is nothing medieval about Baillie's view of the *mode* of the presence.

After admitting that the Roman doctrine is based upon the conviction that the presence is something "prevenient and given", he continues:

Surely it is the same truth that we Presbyterians are endeavouring to express in a safer and surer way when we say that in the sacrament Christ is as truly present to the faith of the receiver as the bread and wine are to his outward senses. "Present to the faith of the receiver"—that is the most real presence conceivable for a divine reality in this present world. The most objective and penetrating kind of presence that God could give us is *through faith*. Any other kind of presence, any local or spatial divine presence, if we could conceive it, would be less real, less besetting, less intimate.⁸

Two comments on this passage suggest themselves. In the first place, the Eucharistic presence, which Baillie repeatedly describes as a "divine presence", seems to be viewed as a presence of Christ in his pure God-head rather than of the incarnate Word in his double character as God and man. This is implied rather than stated and I suspect that, if challenged, Baillie would have corrected himself on this point; nevertheless the lapse seems to me to be significant, for it appears to be connected with the unsatisfactory way in which, as we have seen, Baillie talks about the Incarnation as having "come to an end". Secondly, there is a real vagueness about the words which Baillie italicized—"through faith". To say that spiritual realities can only be *apprehended* by faith, in a way parallel to that in which physical objects are apprehended by sight, is thoroughly legitimate. To infer from this that they are *constituted* by faith is quite illegitimate, and it will only seem plausible if we hold also, in a quasi-Kantian way, that physical objects are constituted by our acts of sensory perception. (I have commented on this elsewhere in a somewhat similar context, that of Charles Gore's Eucharistic theology, for Gore was misled in just this way.⁹) It is true that Baillie does not hold that faith is purely man-made or subjective; on the contrary, faith is, in his view, a gift from God:

This does not mean that somehow we conjure up the divine presence by believing in it, or that we produce the faith out of our own resources and that in response to our faith God gives us his presence.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

⁹ Cf. my *Corpus Christi*, p. 152.

God is prevenient, and faith depends on his actions; he calls it forth. *and that is his way of coming to dwell in a man or a company of men.* That is what he does when he uses the symbolism of the bread and the wine, and the words and the actions, to give himself to us in the sacrament of the Lord's supper.¹⁰

This means, if I have understood him correctly, that in Baillie's view faith constitutes the presence and does not merely apprehend it, though that faith itself is not simply a natural human act but is a sheer gratuitous gift from God. Or, to put this in another way, it is God, not the communicant, who creates the presence, but he does this by the instrumentality of the faith which he creates in us first.

It is an easy slip from this to Baillie's view of the relation between the sacraments of the Old and the New Dispensation. Like Calvin, he insists that there is no difference of kind between them. "Reformed theology", he tells us, "has regularly gone even further than the Catholic tradition in ascribing to [the] Old Testament sacraments the same kind of authority and efficacy as to those of the New Testament."¹¹ This is formally correct, but its emphasis is misleading; for Baillie does not mean that Presbyterians believe about the sacraments of the Old Testament what Catholics believe about those of the New; he means that they believe about the sacraments of the New Testament what Catholics believe about those of the Old. In spite of his avowed desire to have a higher, and not a lower, doctrine of the sacraments than Catholics have, Baillie does not really succeed in his attempt. In any case the assertion points to an important and generally overlooked divergence between Catholic and Protestant theology. And since this is clearly connected with the previously noted divergence about the nature of the Incarnation, it would seem to offer an opportunity for really fruitful investigation.

By its brevity, its charitable tone, and above all its clarity, Baillie's book would seem to provide the ideal material for theological discussion in mixed groups of Anglicans and non-Anglicans, on both the academic and the parochial level. And this, I think, is the use which its author would most desire. It is a matter for thanksgiving that Christians of different denominations are no longer content to confront each other in the attitude of Ronsard:

*Nous louons le Seigneur en hymnes et cantiques,
Et nous prions pour vous qui estes hérétiques.*

On the other hand our very courtesy sometimes prevents us from getting to grips with our real problems. The great excellency of Baillie's book is its refusal to condone this kind of theological indolence.

Sacraments and Worship is an equally useful book of a very different type. It is the first volume of a new Roman Catholic series of hand-books called "Sources of Christian Theology". It consists of a quite admirable collection of passages, in English translation, drawn from both theological and liturgical sources, to illustrate the theology of initiation

¹⁰ Op. cit., p. 101 (italics mine).

¹¹ Ibid., p. 43.

and the Eucharist. As well as the Fathers and Roman Catholic theologians, Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant writers are included. There are admirable introductory and commentary notes, which, while written from a definitely Roman Catholic angle, are always fair and charitable. For its purpose of making out-of-the-way material available to the general reader, this book could hardly be bettered.

E. L. MASCALL

KIERKEGAARD

THE PRAYERS OF KIERKEGAARD. By PERRY D. LE FEVRE. University of Chicago Press (England: Cambridge University Press). 27s. 6d.

Two high testimonies to the excellence of this book are printed on its dust cover; they are from no less persons than James Collins and Walter Lowrie. The latter says: "It is the best book on Kierkegaard that has been written in English or any other language." That sounds exaggerated, and seemingly is so on Dr Lowrie's own showing; for the dust cover quotes him as proceeding to say: "There is no other book on the theme in any other language." If this is so, then as being the only one, of course it is the best, and the gilt is off the gingerbread.

But is it the only one? Is the author right in calling his book "a new interpretation of Kierkegaard's life and thought"? Yes and No. There is a certain newness of approach, but it is one rather of emphasis and method than of content. The interpretative part occupies Part II of the book, and this Part deals not primarily with Kierkegaard's aesthetic, philosophical, or theological themes (as is so often done), but with Kierkegaard's own inner life and struggle. He is represented as a religious writer, with a deep sense of vocation such as every Christian, in his own degree, must have.

Now this is truly important. Many of us have been concerned to stress this essential side of Kierkegaard. One may mention the writings, for example, of Paul Minear. Drs Collins and Lowrie themselves have certainly not omitted it. And I hope I shall not be immodest if I mention my own *Meditations from Kierkegaard*. That book was designed to show the essentially religious value of Kierkegaard, not interpretatively, like le Fevre's Part II, but factually from the Dane himself, by actual translations. And by the way, some of the prayers claimed to be translated by le Fevre for the first time are in my book.

No interpreter can quite escape the religious devotion and importance of Kierkegaard; but the sad fact is that all too many try to do so. "He is one of the most maltreated thinkers of recent centuries", writes Sperna Weiland. "The fact that he is a Christian is again and again neglected or mentioned in a footnote, or it is considered an aspect which one need not take into account." Le Fevre and others like him are concerned to

redress this maltreatment. When le Fevre takes us through the themes of Kierkegaard's writings—Despair, Dread, Fear and Trembling, Infinite Resignation, Suffering, Guilt, Paradox, Reduplication, Repetition, Passion, Subjectivity, and the rest, he ever tries to stress their personal, religious, "existential" value, by referring back to Kierkegaard's own inner religious experience. And he does it extremely well. It sounds indeed an obvious thing to do in dealing with a writer who declares himself from start to finish a religious author, and whose "philosophy" (if he has one) is—existential. But the fact is that there is a great deal of really telling aesthetic and philosophical writing in Kierkegaard which it is essential to grapple with if we are properly to understand him; and it is this which has occupied interpreters all too exclusively. Too frequently they have stopped here, and not gone on to do what Mr le Fevre has rightly done. The chapter "Man of Prayer" is a culminating and crowning survey of the piety of the man himself, and also of the way he interprets prayer. Kierkegaard somewhere says that prayer is the Archimedian point which moves the world, and he certainly put it into operation. Unless we grasp this, we have missed the essential Kierkegaard.

Part I gives us ninety-nine prayers culled from Kierkegaard's writings. Lowrie is not quite accurate in saying "they are complete" (meaning that all Kierkegaard's prayers are now published). Even in the source-book le Fevre follows (Tisseau's *Prières*) there are more. And there are others. Not everybody will find all these prayers to their taste, but as they are Kierkegaard's own communings with God they are in a sense nobody else's concern. But no one can doubt their deep sincerity and richness of devotion; and no one can fail to profit by knowing them, and, as occasion may arise, by using them. They show Kierkegaard as a man who, in spite of all his sufferings, knew the peace of God which passeth all understanding. And they emphasize (what le Fevre in his interpretative part could have emphasized more) Kierkegaard's joy and hope in believing in God's Governance. He is not the merely melancholy Dane he is often represented to be.

T. H. CROXALL

MYSTICISM

MYSTICISM, SACRED AND PROFANE. By R. C. ZAEHNER. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 45s.

THE immediate stimulus which led to the writing of the important work which is now before us was provided by the appearance in 1944 of a small but remarkable book by Mr Aldous Huxley under the title *The Doors of Perception*. In that book the author described his experiences under the influence of the drug mescaline (the active principle of the

plant peyotl), identified them, though not quite unambiguously, with what Christian theology describes as the beatific vision, assumed that all its takers except those whose livers were disordered would find the effects of the drug to be as agreeable and harmless as he did, and vehemently advocated its widespread distribution as a cure for all human restlessness and unhappiness. A good deal of evidence has since been provided by other experimenters for the view that Mr Huxley's experience of the drug was somewhat abnormally pleasant and that its effects upon many people in good health can be horrifying in the extreme. It was however left for Professor Zaehner to make a precise assessment of the effects from the point of view of Christian mystical theology, and in doing this he has in fact produced a highly important treatise on mysticism in general. He sees Mr Huxley's experience as essentially homogeneous with the manic phase of manic-depressive neuroses, and illustrates the point in detail from the writings of Rimbaud, Proust, and John Custance, and also from such nature-mystics as Richard Jefferies. He is emphatic that there is nothing specially religious about it; whatever is experienced in it, it is certainly not an experience of God.

On the wider question of mysticism in general. Professor Zaehner makes two distinctions of quite fundamental importance. The first is the distinction between theistic and non-theistic mysticism; the second is the distinction within non-theistic mysticism between pantheistic (or, as he prefers to call it, pan-en-henic) mysticism, whose aim is union with the natural world as such, and monist mysticism, whose aim is the enjoyment by the soul of itself in deliberate isolation from everything else. I am not sure that the acceptance of these distinctions, valid as I believe them to be, would allay the obstinate objections held by Protestant theologians such as Brunner and Niebuhr against all forms of mysticism, but it would at least make the controversy less confused than it has usually been. There are sections of Professor Zaehner's discussion in which it is by no means easy for the reader to find his way, but this is largely if not entirely due to the author's determination not to achieve clarity at the cost of over-simplification; this is specially true of the chapters on Hinduism, in which the protean character of its subject calls for incessant vigilance and concentration. There are occasional assertions with which theologians may wish to cavil, such as the identification of the natural mystical experience with the experience of Adamic or unfallen man. Nor am I personally altogether happy about the use made in certain places of the concepts of Jung's psychological theory, though my own ignorance may be responsible for these hesitations. There can, however, be no doubt that Professor Zaehner has written a work of outstanding importance, with which every subsequent writer on comparative mysticism will have to reckon.

E. L. MASCALL

RICHARD ROLLE

THE MELOS AMORIS OF RICHARD ROLLE OF HAMPOLE. Edited by E. J. F. ARNOULD. Blackwell. 50s.

THOUGH it has remained almost unknown since the fourteenth century, the *Melos Amoris* is among the chief Latin works of Richard Rolle of Hampole and one of the three specifically mystical ones. It has been called, not quite fantastically, his Confessions. As a writing it certainly reveals his inmost heart, the heart of a man whose teaching powerfully influenced Walter Hilton and to a less degree the Lady Julian. But its text has never till now been printed and published.

Professor Arnould of Trinity College, Dublin, has here taken the best manuscript, once the property of Archbishop Ussher and now in the library of Trinity College, and carefully collated it with the nine other manuscripts and the various fragments still extant, and has issued a complete text with other supporting papers as a step towards a fuller estimate and appreciation of this early English mystic and writer. His sole original purpose, he says, was to establish a reliable text from the group of variously unsatisfactory manuscripts. But he has added for the sake of the student a long introduction. This, as he says, attempts no comprehensive critical study but gives a synopsis of the main topics, illustrated by passages from the *Melos* and accompanied by representative quotations from other of Rolle's little-known Latin works. The editing is completed, along with a necessary glossary of Rolle's more unusual Latin words and usages, by the inclusion of two articles, whose substance Professor Arnould published some years ago, on points of Rolle's biography and character. One disposes of Rolle's alleged rebellious attitude to a bishop unnamed, and the other, with equal care, of his alleged sojourn at the Sorbonne.

The *Melos Amoris* is the treatise which Carl Horstman in his pioneer work on Rolle misnamed, as it now seems, and caused all who have come after to misname, the *Melum Contemplativorum Ardentium in Amore Dei*. It is Rolle's attempt to describe "the glory and perfection of the Saints", though, as Professor Arnould points out, Rolle's concern was not so much for the "glory" as for the "perfection", by which he meant "the gradual elevation towards the mystical summits". To this subject he brought an original contribution and made it with his customary gusto.

The treatise is diffuse in manner but fairly constant in underlying theme. For Rolle the experiences of the spiritual life were marked by "calor", "dulcor", and "canor", enjoyed more or less in that succession. "Melos" naturally corresponds with "canor". This particular work therefore deals with the highest stage on the way to perfection and takes the reader as far as Rolle's doctrine of the state of continuous union.

Five stages have marked Rolle's progress in the spiritual life to this point. These were, flight from the world, inspired by thought of Christ's passion; a period of peace occupied by further meditation on the passion; fresh temptation as a novice hermit; the victory over

temptation; elevation to divine love and grounding in its steadfastness and serenity. He therefore proceeds to describe and commend this last ascent, and to exemplify it from his own life, the life of a hermit who was also a persecuted wanderer. He likens himself to Cain and says: *In hoc exilio incerte sedis fio, de loco ad locum transeo*. In passing, therefore, he refutes his detractors, with force and occasionally, when the matter warrants, with an academic accuracy. His determination here lay in his desire to uphold the superiority of the hermit life over the conventual against those in monasteries who had not understood the circumstances that caused the hermit of Subiaco to write the Holy Rule. But it remains true that his chief and declared intention was to aid others to enjoy "canor".

He fulfils his purpose through a sort of cadenced prose and in a rich and naturally disordered variety of method. But the peculiar style gathers everything into a kind of uniformity by the use of alliteration, and although angling after and achieving an almost antic alliterative arrangement, also attempts and actually attains a remarkable rhetorical rhythm. Professor Arnould briefly examines this style. There seems a likelihood that both individual words and initial letters were like grains round which Rolle's restless thought could crystallize; so that a style which might seem simply wooden or barbarous does in fact become part of the living communication of the man.

With some brief remarks on Rolle's doctrine, both the mystical and the dogmatic, on the dating of the *Melos*, on its sources, and on its extant manuscripts and their collation, Professor Arnould completes his useful work of editorship for this lyrical but commonsense Yorkshireman.

HUGH, S.S.F.

SPIRITUAL LIFE

A LETTER TO HIS SISTER. By ST AELRED OF RIEVAULX, edited by GEOFFREY WEBB and ADRIAN WALKER. Mowbray. 5s.

THIS gem is itself an answer. St Aelred in his closing sentences gives us the reason for his having written: "Now you have what you wanted and asked of me. I have given you information concerning the body, so that you may be able to rule and govern the outward man. I have given you also a way of purifying the inward man of vices, so as to make him beautiful in virtue. And I have shown you in a threefold meditation, how you must nourish your soul and stir yourself to the love of God."

The matter of this "little book", as he calls it, is governed by the fact that his sister to whom he writes is an anchoress. His rulings and advice are for a solitary. "Sister, know well the conditions and calling of your life . . . You who are dead to the world, must be deaf to hear anything

of the world, and dumb to speak it. . . ." Yet such is the importance and simplicity of the teaching that anyone in the world to-day would find most real profit in studying it.

He illustrates the truths of his letter from the everyday events of nature around him. While they make vividly clear the points of his teaching they charm us to-day as they reveal the life of that period. For instance, in the preservation of the spirit of true chastity: "Sister, you must never be too sure of yourself, but you must always dread and suspect your own frailty. As a timorous dove, haunt the rivers of clear water, where you may see the reflection of the ravenous hawk when he flies above you, and beware! These rivers are the Holy Scriptures, that gush out from the well of wisdom, that is Christ. These will show you not only the shadow of the devil's suggestion, but also advice and counsel for avoiding it. For there is nothing that so banishes wicked and unclean thoughts as does the reading of Holy Scripture. . . ." Again, the Wedding Garment, the perfection of holiness without which none shall see the Lord, perseverance in the life of grace, perfecting virtues, he illustrates in a startling and most helpful way from the detail of the stages of the processing of flax in the making of fine linen.

Refreshing as we find his vivid pictures, so too are his brief phrases packed with deep meaning. "The beginning of things that are to come, and the end of things that are now, is DEATH. . . . Birds and beasts are very careful to avoid death, and defend their lives by swift running, and by hiding in their lairs, and in many other ways." As to Heaven he writes: "We cannot know what it will be like . . . but this I know for sure . . . that you will lack nothing that you desire, and you will not have anything that you would rather be without." He explains the blessing of "holy poverty"—detachment: "Be sure that you do not shut your soul up in a purse full of silver and gold and earthly riches, for your soul will never be able to fly up easily to the joy and happiness of heaven if it is burdened with even so much as a pennyweight."

In his teaching on prayer perhaps lies the chief value. Personal sharing in the Gospel scenes is his method of meditation: "Dear Sister, go with your Lady to the hill . . . wait until Mary goes up to Bethlehem, and run after her with meek devotion. When she turns into the poor inn to bear her child, come forward and do whatever service you can." At the Last Judgement: "Sister, imagine now within your heart that you are between these two sides, before the judgement-seat of God, and not yet sent either to left or right. If He were to put you on His left side you would not be able to say that He was unjust."

Here is much needed medicine for the vagueness and shallow optimism of our day. It may be right to demur at his mis-reading of Scripture where he says that our Lord was born *in* the inn, or in his application of the state of Cain to himself and his contradicting himself in that matter. His materialistic presentation of hell with "crawling worms to gnaw me, wicked spirits with hellish instruments of torture, the stench of sin, and coals of fire to burn and torture me" may perhaps alienate some. However, as with all the greatest writers on the spiritual

ite, there is only a bigness of Scriptural teaching, nothing of a local ecclesiastical axe to grind. Here we are lifted above all narrowness of man-made traditions into the wideness of the Love of Jesus.

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

PATRISTICS I

ATHENAGORAS: EMBASSY FOR THE CHRISTIANS. THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. (Ancient Christian Writers, Volume XXIII). Translated and annotated by JOSEPH HUGH CREEHAN, S.J. Longmans. 21s.

CONSIDERABLE attention has been devoted to the writings of Athenagoras in the important series of editions of the Fathers in translation which have been appearing both in French and English in recent years. An edition of the *Embassy*, translated into French with a full introduction and less adequate notes, from the able pen of G. Bardy in the series "Sources chrétiennes", was followed by a necessarily briefer treatment in C. C. Richardson's volume *Early Christian Fathers* in the invaluable "Library of Christian Classics" published by the S.C.M. Press.

The present volume in the series "Ancient Christian Writers", edited by Fr Creehan, also includes the short treatise on the Resurrection. It provides everything that the general reader needs for his guidance and enjoyment as well as much valuable material for specialist study. The scholarship of the editor is fully adequate, but is never allowed to become overloaded. The introduction perhaps lacks something of the distinction which characterized all the work of Bardy, but gives an excellent general survey of the life and background, philosophical as well as theological, of the Apologist. De Labriolle's theory that the writer had Montanist proclivities is rightly dismissed. But Fr Creehan seems somewhat over-optimistic in his assessment of the historical value of the extract from Philip of Side which contains virtually all that has been recorded about the life of Athenagoras. While his discussion of the philosophical background of Athenagoras is both balanced and thorough, he is perhaps inclined to credit the Apologist with a theological maturity which would be difficult to substantiate from the scanty data at our disposal. While there are some interesting anticipations both in idea and terminology, it would be suprising to find the standards of a later orthodoxy anticipated to such an extent at this date and in a work of this character.

The notes to the *Embassy* are of excellent quality. The editor is at his best in handling the classical allusions in which the work abounds. Interesting and up-to-date material is drawn from the field of classical epigraphy, and the section on the early history of classical art displays a particularly sure hand and firm touch. But is the authority of

Herodotus as an historian quite as high as Fr Creehan at times leads us to believe? The textual problems of the work are handled with independence and discrimination, and the editor does not hesitate to criticize his predecessors in this field with occasional asperity, but considerable good sense. His learning is occasionally lightened by flashes of humour.

The commentary on the treatise on the Resurrection inevitably has rather a different character. The work itself inevitably is much less concrete and more philosophical in bent than the *Embassy*. The leading ideas and technical terms of the author are well noted and briefly traced to their secular sources. Here Fr Creehan keeps his eye on Galen as well as upon Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics. The editor makes frequent reference to the Scholastics, especially to St Thomas Aquinas. That is only to be expected, and in the main adds greatly to the interest of his comments. It tends, however, at times to lift the treatise out of its immediate context. The really significant framework of reference is provided by other similar Patristic treatments of the doctrine, and here at least one reader would have welcomed more guidance than this edition affords. While it might be difficult to provide such a volume within this particular series, the real place for this little treatise is in a volume of similar works which would provide the proper standard of comparison.

The work, taken as a whole, is a worthy addition to a series which has already proved its worth.

H. E. W. TURNER

PATRISTICS II

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS. By HENRY BETTENSON. Oxford University Press. 16s.

FLAME IN THE MIND. By GORDON LEWIS PHILLIPS. Longmans. 5s. 6d. paper 3s. 6d.

THE Bible, or at any rate the New Testament, has had its full share of *vulgarisation* in the past few years. Now it is the turn of the Fathers. They have of course had their turn before, but the motives which prompted the Tractarian ventures of a century ago were rather different, being closely connected with a specifically Anglican appeal to the authority of the early Church. The current revival of interest in the Fathers is much broader based than that (significantly, the two best current series of translations derive from an interdenominational and a Roman Catholic initiative respectively) and not unconnected with the problems which always arise when the scriptures are studied in isolation. Those who are concerned about the current vogue of fundamentalism, as well as lovers of good invective, will be grateful to Fr Phillips for rescuing from oblivion and using extensively in his introductory chapter an essay on

"The Right Use of the Fathers" published in 1709 by a clergyman named William Reeves, which for the following, and other topical treasures, deserves to be better known:

"There are some others", he says, "who lay claim to the spirit for the interpretation of the letter, and if the pretenders could make good their claim we should be ruled by the prophets; but experience has taught us what a wild interpreter this pretence to the spirit has been; that by setting weak heads and strong passions to work upon the Bible, men have been spirited out of their senses, and ran about stark Bible-mad."

Reeves' contention that "the sense of a law is best understood by those who lived nearest to the time of making it" will awaken an echo in many informed quarters at the present time, and anything that will put its application within the reach of the wider Christian public is to be warmly welcomed.

The two series already referred to, the S.C.M. "Library of Christian Classics", and "Ancient Christian Writers", have delivered the would-be student from dependence on the, all too often, deplorably poor literary quality of the Victorian translations. But a series which appears at the average rate of one volume per author is likely to be a heavy drain on the pockets of many who would otherwise be enthusiastic. There are some indications that the paper-backs are preparing to move into this field, which is much to be wished; but a popular single-volume introduction to the Fathers has remained a *desideratum*. It is now supplied, simultaneously, on two different levels.

The two books under review cover almost exactly the same field, that of the pre-Nicene Fathers, though Mr Bettenson sensibly stretches it to include Athanasius, while Fr Phillips, because of limited compass, has regretfully to exclude Irenaeus and Cyprian. It is interesting that, outside the small world of the Apostolic Fathers, their selection of passages hardly ever coincides.

Mr Bettenson, whose earlier selection *Documents of the Christian Church* is a guarantee of his competence in this field, now attempts to do for the pre-Nicene Fathers, though in less esoteric fashion, what Przywara in *An Augustine Synthesis* did for the Doctor of Grace. He presents a series of extracts, translated by himself, and carefully arranged under such headings as God, Man, Incarnation, Atonement, Holy Spirit Church, Sacraments, Eschatology, etc. To these he has prefixed a well-informed and judicious introduction, which would serve to introduce the non-specialist, and even maybe the aspirant to specialist study, not only to this book but to the field as a whole. The selection is most comprehensive, and the translation clear and close, readable and free (so far as your reviewer has been able to check it) from inaccuracy (except for a slip in Ignatius, *Ephesians*, iv, where Ignatius wrote *the bishop*, but *God* appears in the translation). The book can be confidently recommended to anyone with the educational attainments which its author presupposes; in particular it will be a godsend to the more ambitious parochial study circle, and to those who teach religious knowledge at sixth-form level in schools.

Mr Bettenson's selected passages do not tell us much of their authors as people, and almost the only expression of personal preference he permits himself is one of dislike for Justin Martyr, whose writings he regards as "woolly". Fr Phillips' imagination, on the other hand, has been so kindled by Justin's account of his conversion that he has borrowed a phrase from it for the title of his book. This is a good illustration of the difference between their respective approaches. Fr Phillips aims at that wider public which is only likely to be reached by the methods of contemporary journalism. These demand, first, concentration on personalities, since the reading public is invariably interested in people; secondly, an abundance of topical references, since the reader's imaginative horizon is generally limited to the contemporary world; thirdly, since readers cannot take much print at a time, that the quotations should be brief and well sign-posted. Fr Phillips contrives to satisfy all these tests without ever giving the impression that he is patronizing his readers. He really makes his subjects live; his vignette of Tertullian, "the Lamennais of North Africa", as he calls him, "hell bent for ruthless perfection", is especially brilliant, and the book abounds in provocative asides, such as this on Tertullian's secession to Montanism: "Young men of military families have a well-known disposition to this kind of collapse, and the line from Tertullian through men like Henry Ireton and General Gordon, up to certain famous soldiers in our own day, is marked by the same features . . ." He succeeds in relating the elements of his story to familiar features in Anglican life and liturgy; and his translations—freer than Mr Bettenson's, not noticeably more "modern" but enlivened here and there by pithy paraphrase—are always links in the narrative, never interruptions of it.

Fr Phillips is no stranger to academic theology, but he writes with a fine disregard for scholarly caution, which, though it will enliven and not seriously mislead his readers, is likely to cause some raising of the eyebrows in certain learned quarters. These will doubt, for instance, whether the early history of Christianity in Antioch can be reconstructed from the references in Acts with quite the confidence that he displays; and while it is something of a *tour de force* to relate for popular consumption the story of the vicissitudes of the Epistles of St Ignatius, the work might well have been done with greater accuracy. In particular they may hesitate to accept his invitation to them to read 1 Peter, with Dr F. L. Cross, as a paschal liturgy. But it is only fair to add that he fully admits the provisional character of this hypothesis; and the unbiassed reader will acknowledge that, so read, this epistle makes, as he suggests, a remarkably effective "imaginative bridge" between the New Testament and the life of the early Church, which he goes on to describe.

It is much to be hoped that Mr Bettenson's book will fall into the hands of all those who are already hungry for patristic nourishment; and that those still without stomach for it will have their appetites whetted by reading Fr Phillips.

HUMPHREY GREEN

PATRISTICS III

TERTULLIAN: THE TREATISE AGAINST HERMOGENES. (Ancient Christian Writers, Vol. XXIV.) Edited by J. H. WASZINK. Longmans. 21s.

HERMOGENES was a painter from the East who settled in Carthage, having adopted, or worked up, a partially Christian theology determined throughout by his beliefs about matter. Though often classed with the Gnostics, he differs from most of them in that he neither differentiated between the true God and the Creator nor believed that matter is intrinsically evil. It is, for him, neither good nor evil, neither corporeal nor incorporeal; and it is co-eternal with God.

The treatise itself is difficult, and I find it tiresome reading, despite the publisher's assurance that it is among the most interesting of Tertullian's works. Still, it has its interest and value, and we must unquestionably be grateful to Dr Waszink of Leyden for elucidating it, and for doing so in English. It is the first time that it has been treated with such fulness and accuracy. Nor could anyone be better qualified to do the work than the erudite and precise author of the encyclopaedic commentary on the *De Anima*, a treatise which has many points of contact with *Adversus Hermogenem*.

Waszink's principal object is to make clear what Hermogenes believed and how Tertullian attempted to refute him. He provides a good introduction which summarizes Hermogenes' position, analyses the treatise, and explains the evidence for the text. Oehler had based his text on the worst of the extant manuscripts; Kroymann had a much better foundation, but (as usual) spoilt his work by the multiplicity of his conjectures. Waszink has recently published his own much improved text in the Dutch collection, *Stromata*, which naturally underlies the present translation. The English version in the present volume is infinitely superior to that of Peter Holmes in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, and frequently corrects the generally reliable German translation of Kellner, which was based on Oehler's poor text. In view of the nature of the treatise "containing so many subtle and over-subtle arguments", Dr Waszink decided to make his version as literal as possible, even at the risk of "laborious and immoderately long sentences". In the circumstances this was a sensible line to take, for no one, I think, is going to read this work for its literary graces.

The eighty pages of notes which follow the translation are very valuable indeed, both when they are discussing the text and when they are clarifying the involved argument. A special feature, found also in his notes to the *De Anima*, is Waszink's unravelling of Tertullian's elliptical and otherwise irregular syllogisms. Hermogenes' debt to Plato and the later Platonists (rather than to Marcion) is explained, and so is Tertullian's debt to Theophilus of Antioch, who had written against Hermogenes before he left the East. Not that we have sufficient evidence to discern precisely how much Tertullian took over from Theophilus, and how much was his own, though we may feel pretty sure who

invented some of the livelier, but less fair, sallies. Incidentally, Waszink's use of Quispel's *De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem* will serve to introduce this valuable study to any English readers who have missed it.

I repeat, *Adversus Hermogenem* is often tiresome reading. It would be a mistake, however, to dismiss its content as an entirely dead controversy. There are many modern forms of Gnosticism refusing to take matter seriously, and abuse of the word "spiritual" is very common. Even the best-intentioned Christian, bewildered by the discoveries of modern science, may at times be tempted to say that, after all, matter does not really matter, that God will save our souls. The early theologians who took up the cudgels against Hermogenes, Marcion, and the Gnostics direct our attention to truths which a historically-grounded Christianity must hold fast, however severe may be the scientific problems which we are thereby compelled to face.

S. L. GREENSLADE

SAINT CUTHBERT

THE RELICS OF SAINT CUTHBERT. Studies by various authors, collected and edited with an historical introduction by C. F. BATTISCOMBE. Printed for the Dean and Chapter of Durham at the University Press, Oxford. £10 10s.

THIS sumptuous volume is evidence of the *pietas* and public spirit of the Dean and Chapter. The Friends of Durham Cathedral have financed the publication, the Oxford Press have produced what is even for them an outstanding example of typography and coloured illustration, and the book has had an accomplished and enthusiastic editor in Colonel Battiscombe, till lately Chapter Clerk and Keeper of the Records at Durham. He has collected a company of experts, who are, as he truly says, of international reputation, whose knowledge of their several subjects, though it is far beyond the power of the present reviewer, or indeed, it might almost be said, of any single critic, to verify from his own resources, is plainly very complete. There are sentences like this:

If we are right in deriving the style of the Durham embroideries from Sassanian [neo-Persian] sources developed by Byzantine textiles in the ninth century and combined there with the figure style of the illuminations of the early Macedonian Renaissance, the need for adaptation to native tradition of this foreign importation can be readily understood.

or this:

The parallels cited by Schmidt are not wholly convincing, and that of the candelabrum tree to the Nancy silk is not borne out by a close examination of the details. The tree, indeed, with its

elaborate stem and formal offshoots, is more akin to that on a Seljuk eleventh to twelfth century silk in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and the double curve of the leaves to the tree on an eleventh-century silk in the Textile Museum of the District of Columbia.

which suggest that nothing in recent research has escaped their notice. Or there is Dr Plenderleith's description of the means employed by Mrs Antrobus and the British Museum Research Laboratory staff for the examination of the woven silks:

Much of the material was mildewed, and, as all could not be washed, sterilization was considered necessary. This was undertaken by the Laboratory staff. Thymol was employed as the fungicide, either in the form of vapour or by the contact method, using paper previously impregnated. The larger pieces, when quite dry, were put in contact with thymolized paper and placed between glass sheets. The many small fragments, on the other hand, were spread out on cardboard trays and placed on the shelves of an airtight cupboard where they were exposed to the fumes of molten thymol for a fortnight, at temperatures rising to a maximum of 85° F. A suitable concentration was kept up by arranging for the thymol to be in the molten condition for about two hours daily.

These extracts are from some of the more abstrusely technical parts of the book, which would tax a combination of the weaving skill of a Penelope and the general wisdom of an Odysseus to appraise. Where the ordinary reviewer is more at home, and can apply his familiar standards, as in the ninety-eight pages of the Introduction, which tell the story of the flight from Lindisfarne, the wanderings of the monks through Northumbria, the signs which indicated and later confirmed the choice of Durham as a resting-place, the magnificent ceremony of the Translation in 1104, and the subsequent re-openings of the tomb, or in Mr Colgrave's spirited sketch of Saint Cuthbert and his times, the verdict is wholly favourable. The only slip seems to be in the description of Archbishop Theodore as Saint Theodore. He ought to have been canonized, but he never was. The plural form "appendixes" is unusual, but the patriotic principle behind the spelling is manifest and is on the whole to be commended.

The book establishes beyond all doubt two facts. One is that the legend, which seems to have originated with Alban Butler in 1745, that the bones of the Saint were secretly removed at some date between December 1539 and May 1541, and buried in another place, has no foundation. The other is that the Relics described by Raine at the first modern opening in 1827, after which the bones, together with the cloven skull believed to be that of Saint Oswald, were re-interred, and the Relics, the Altar-top of oak encased in silver, the cross, the comb, the stole, two maniples, bracelets, gold wire, fragments of five vestments, were laid up in the Cathedral Library, are really those which were seen at the Translation in 1104. The pectoral cross, hidden in the folds of the draperies, was happily not noticed by the King's Commissioners in "the

frightful ravishment" of 1539. The relics are all still at Durham, except the ring, and the gospel-book, believed on good grounds to have belonged to Saint Cuthbert. These two have found kind homes at Ushaw and Stonyhurst. Everything described in the book may be considered as "in a broad sense genuine relics of Saint Cuthbert".

It is all faithfully and minutely described. There is even a reprint, with the music, of the Durham services in honour of Saint Cuthbert, and an examination by Dom Anselm Hughes of Nashdom of medieval polyphony at Durham. The hundred pages of the account of Dr Hitzinger of Harvard of the coffin-reliquary are perhaps rather over-loaded with detail, but the motive is clearly the scholarly desire to explore every possibility. The numerous illustrations, many of which show the sadly mutilated material on which the textile experts had to work, are a priceless addition to the book. The whole production is a splendid tribute to the scholarship of the English-speaking world, Great Britain, the U.S.A., and Canada, reinforced, as constant references reveal, by the scholarship of the Continent.

S. C. CARPENTER

ORIGINS OF ANGLICANISM

WHITGIFT AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By V. J. K. BROOK. English Universities Press. 8s. 6d.

THE method of the "Teach Yourself History" series is to open up a general theme through the biography of some key person belonging to the period. The present volume admirably fulfils this ideal. Through the great Elizabethan archbishop we are introduced to a lively and comprehensive picture of the Church in its struggle to reform itself and at the same time retain its identity. Familiar and involved as the story is, it attains fresh interest and lucidity under the author's skilful treatment.

Estimates of Whitgift vary between Macaulay's "narrow-minded, mean and tyrannical priest" and Strype's "man born for the benefit of his country and the good of his church". General opinion to-day seems to endorse Strype's view as against Macaulay's. With that opinion Mr Brook is in full agreement, as was Whitgift's last biographer, Dr Dawley, in a readable volume that might well have found a place in the book-list here. The present author, who for twenty-two years was Censor of the St Catherine's Society in Oxford, evidently finds in Whitgift a kindred spirit. He describes him as a "born administrator", and yet emphasizes very properly the essential sanity of his theological judgement, which made him more than a match for the Puritans.

What was perhaps even more important for the future of Anglicanism was the sympathy between Elizabeth and her Archbishop, whom she described in a famous phrase as her "little black husband". This was to

the credit of both parties since in theological colour they differed by several shades, the Queen being quite seriously inclined to the religion of her father, a much more "high church" position than that of Whitgift. It was largely out of the combination of the two that Anglicanism became what it has since remained, a *via media* upon which many can walk together even if they are not wholly agreed. Although the author appears to share the fashionable doubt about the genuineness of Elizabeth's piety, he has given us a valuable contribution to the full understanding of the situation. It will be appreciated as much by the student as by the general reader.

W.W.

STALWART PRELATE

WHITE KENNETT, 1660-1728, BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH. By G. V. BENNETT. S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 42s.

THIS book will have a twofold appeal. The cordial "Foreword" by Dr Norman Sykes is sufficient guarantee of the importance of Dr Bennett's work as a contribution to historical scholarship; at the same time the non-specialist, whose conception of the later Stuart and early Hanoverian period is derived from Ogg, Trevelyan, and Plumb will be very grateful for this new presentation of one of the key ecclesiastical figures of the Augustan age.

The stature of Dr Bennett's work can be conveniently gauged by a reading of his "Note on Sources" (pp. 272-5). Previous biographies of White Kennett were two: that published two years after his death by a friend as a defence against the posthumous attacks of Kennett's opponents, and the article in *D.N.B.*; both superficial and negligible in comparison with the present "Life". Dr Bennett's book, which has won the Thirlwall Prize, rests on profound learning and the most conscientious research among the profusion of MS. material and contemporary printed matter available; the 107 volumes of Kennett's personal papers and his 60-odd published works were only two of the very many, widely scattered sources that were thoroughly examined. Anyone who has used original documents will perhaps be not least impressed by the negative results which the biographer modestly records, e.g. "The Newcastle papers dealing with this period . . . were searched without yielding any definite material."

But this book is more than scholarly. The writer never forgets that learning is the handmaid of instruction; his exhaustive knowledge of the man and his times is admirably used to present a living picture. White Kennett emerges as a vivid, coherent personality, a character of striking individuality, a leader in Church and State whose career illuminates the violent controversies of the reigns of Anne and George I. Dr Bennett's

balanced judgement will not let him ignore the human limitations of his subject—the self-conscious rectitude in debate which exasperated his opponents, the excessive care for detail from which his scholarship was apt to suffer, his undue deference to his masterful wife; but these defects are insignificant compared with the many noble qualities that Kennett possessed. To enumerate these might blunt the interest and sense of discovery with which the book deserves to be read; but one may be permitted to record the surprise and satisfaction felt in finding a churchman who was so closely identified with one side in the political and ecclesiastical disputes of the day, consistently inspired and directed by a high-minded spiritual devotion that stemmed from the Puritan inspiration of the seventeenth century. Whether as champion of a minority policy in Convocation or as a prodigiously hard-working and latterly disappointed diocesan, Kennet never allowed the worldliness or malice of his contemporaries to infect the noble Christian idealism that was the mainspring of his faith and life.

Two aspects of Kennett's career will particularly draw the attention of the layman of to-day. In view of the interest in history which has increased so much in this country since the last war, many readers will find chapter 7 among the most fascinating. One of Kennett's earliest works was his monumental "*Parochial Antiquities*", which pioneered a new field with far wider and deeper research than its title suggested, and throughout his life he remained one of the leading members of the new school of constitutional and ecclesiastical historians. Though much of his historical study and writing was undertaken with the purpose of confuting his opponents in, e.g., the long Convocation controversy, he maintained throughout a shrewd judgement and scrupulous treatment of sources, which, combined with his enormous industry of research, assure him his place among the fathers of Church of England history.

Secondly, a generation which enjoys the benefits of the Welfare State will note with interest the readiness with which Kennett devoted himself to philanthropic causes. A founder-member of both the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G., he was a vigorous promoter and organizer of charity schools, keenly supported the foundation of public libraries, and often visited prisons. It is almost superfluous to mention that as parish priest, dean, and bishop he was a model of pastoral zeal.

That this is an admirable book will by now be obvious. The author's style is direct and forceful, his exposition clear and misprints so rare as to be negligible. The only slight defect in Dr Bennett's presentation is a tendency to treat the facets of Kennett's career in too much isolation from each other; e.g. it would be welcome to have the account of his public activities punctuated by references to contemporary details of his domestic life. But this is a trivial matter to set against the debt that one feels to the writer on closing his book.

A. P. WHITAKER

WHY GO WEST?

ERRAND INTO THE WILDERNESS. By PERRY MILLER. Harvard University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 38s.

MR MILLER has already made his reputation as an interpreter of the American past, and this massive volume is the major fruit of a quarter of a century's study and research. It consists of a series of essays, many of which have appeared before, but the author modestly remarks that he has silently expunged his more egregious lapses. A New England Exhibition at Brown University in 1952 adopted as its title a phrase from an Election Sermon delivered by the Reverend Samuel Danforth in 1670: "A Brief Recognition of New England's Errand into the Wilderness"—hence the ingenious title of this book. The essays are philosophical rather than purely historical. An attempt is made to grapple with basic questions. What fundamental cause induced the original colonists to take the drastic step of going forth into the new world? What exactly was the nature of their mission, and how did their original philosophy develop? These related problems have been vital from the first in American experience, and need to be extricated from the orgy of biblical language dear to the Puritans and from Emerson's influential doctrine of the over-soul, with its various ramifications. Gradually in these racily written pages the reader can watch a distinctive American *Weltanschauung* come into being. The settlers had started out with the dream of a model society to be established in purity by the elect in a new continent. All too soon they or their children learned that Europe was no longer interested in such idealism. They were now Americans, left to build up a separate culture.

The early history of Congregationalism is an enthralling study, which can be appreciated as background to the sober scholarship of Congregationalists at such centres of learning as Harvard and Yale to-day. Since churches were commanded of God to consist only of the elect, they should be separated from the corruptions of the Established Church and constituted after the proper biblical model. Among the greatest representatives of this school of thought was Thomas Hooker, who had already fled from England to Holland. He arrived in Massachusetts in 1633, when the three-year-old colony had already established a policy, his advocacy of which had led to his exile. His influence and his differences with other Puritan leaders may here be followed.

In this whole study it is essential to remember that every Western State assumed that only one church could exist within its borders: every citizen must conform to its requirements and pay taxes to support it. This definitely applies to the Puritans in New England, though only a minority might be provably elect. If they fined, whipped, jailed, or even hanged those who disagreed with them, they would have done the same in England, if they had the power. Mr Miller remembers that it is "almost pathetic" to see how puzzled the New England leaders were, when at the end of the seventeenth century the idea of toleration was

permeating European thought. They could hardly be persuaded that they had done wrong in whipping Quakers, cutting off the ears of blasphemers, exiling Antinomians, fining Anabaptists, and executing those convicted of witchcraft. In 1861 Samuel Willard of Boston pointed out that the business of the first Planters was "not toleration". Indeed they were "professed enemies" of it. Forty years later the scene was so changed that "Puritanism in the true sense of the word was dead".

It is deeply interesting to follow in these pages the dilemma with which pure Calvinism was faced—if a man is elected, why should he bother about good works?—and the formulation of the Covenant theology as an attempt to meet the difficulty. Among the greatest Calvinists was Jonathan Edwards; and perhaps the best essay in this book tells of his preaching and the Great Awakening: "The people yelled and shrieked, they rolled in the aisles, they crowded up to the pulpit and begged him to stop, they cried for mercy." And well they might, if they accepted what Edwards taught about Hell: "Your bodies . . . burning and roasting all this while in these glowing flames . . . will remain to roast though an eternity, which will not have been at all shortened by what shall have been past."

Can an errand into the wilderness be run indefinitely? This is the question passed in a final eschatological chapter on "The End of the World".

A short review can do little more than what the reader's appetite for a fine, original work.

FREDERICK HOOD

LOCAL HISTORY

JOURNAL OF THE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE CHURCH IN WALES, Vol. VI.

Edited by E. T. DAVIES. No price.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE PAST AND PRESENT, Vol. II, No. 3. 2s. 6d.

FOR Volume VI of the *Journal of the Historical Society of the Church in Wales*, the editor, Canon E. T. Davies, has written an article throwing new light upon the extraordinary Italianate Temple, erected by John Wood in the ruins of the medieval cathedral of Llandaff, during the first half of the eighteenth century. Appendixes give lists of benefactors to the work of restoration, as well as of the amounts subscribed to "briefs" in various counties, and the expenses which these "briefs" entailed.

The volume should be of particular value to scholars and others concerned with the history of the diocese of St Asaph, since this receives attention in no less than three of the contributions. There is first, a learned article by the Reverend S. M. Harris, who deals thoroughly with St Asaf, and with the ancient liturgical forms for his festival—to be

found, remarkably enough, not in Wales, but in the early sixteenth-century service books of the diocese of Aberdeen.

Secondly, Mr G. M. Griffiths has attempted to give a digest of the contents of the St Asaph "Register" of Episcopal Acts, covering the period from 1506 to 1571.

Thirdly, there is a contribution entitled: "Bishop William Beveridge and the Church of England: The Return to the Primitive Ideal", in which Dr A. G. Macwilliam has set out to show how this early eighteenth-century bishop perfectly represented the Anglican fathers, and played his part in the development of that "Via Media", which was their ideal, and has now become a reality. William Beveridge's "grand aim" was, says Dr Macwilliam, "first, a return to the thought and practice of the early church, and secondly its adaptation to the needs of the English people". The results of this were to be seen: (a) in a renewed devotion to the Book of Common Prayer, with more frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion, and the daily recitation of Morning and Evening Prayer; (b) in the fillip given to educational developments, especially as regards the Charity School movement; and, (c) with the founding of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in 1701, in the beginning of systematic missionary work. Beveridge had put his ideals into practice at the church of St Peter, Cornhill, in the City of London, where he was rector for some thirty years. What he might have done in the diocese of St Asaph of which he became bishop in 1704, remains largely a matter for conjecture, since he died in 1708, after holding the see for little more than four years.

The term "briefs" has already occurred in connection with Canon Davies' article on Llandaff cathedral. Canon G. Richards in the section entitled "Royal Briefs for the Restoration of Churches in Wales" gives fresh information *à propos* of that often rather puzzling first rubric following the Nicene Creed in the Holy Communion Service. The days have gone when "briefs" were read out in churches, as directed by the Prayer Book. Or have they? The two letters, written in the 1930s by parish priests in England to the Rector of Dolgelley in Co. Merioneth, and reprinted here in pages 63 and 64, suggest that we may witness a revival of what, a couple of centuries ago, was a common custom, even though, as Canon Richards' article reveals, it was by no means an altogether profitable one financially.

Among contributions to the recent volume of *Northamptonshire Past and Present*, there is one by the Reverend J. S. Reynolds on a fifteenth-century Northamptonshire parson, "Master Thomas Stokke of Easton-on-the-Hill". It is pleasing to learn that this worthy priest is still remembered daily at evening prayers in the chapel of Browne's Hospital, Stamford; for he both helped in founding this, and by his will left to each of its poor inhabitants the sum of twelve pence.

"Cricket owes a real debt to the clergy", says a recent writer on the English clergy in the nineteenth century. Certainly, the number of clerical names appearing in Mr J. D. Coldham's article on "Early

Northamptonshire Cricket" would seem to bear this out.

Those who are specially interested in the clergy of last century will appreciate the note "A Clerical Character" (p. 160). This was the Reverend Loraine Smith, the incumbent of Passenham, near Stony Stratford, whose notoriety led to his being mentioned in one of the early railway guide-books. Whilst one may rejoice to discover a parson so conscientious in fulfilling the Christian duty of hospitality as to invite his whole congregation—small though it be—to luncheon *after* his sermon, it may be questioned whether Mr Loraine Smith's practice on at least one occasion, of providing them with luncheon *instead* of a sermon is quite so praiseworthy!

GORDON HUELIN

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

THE DELINQUENT CHILD AND THE COMMUNITY. By DONALD FORD.
Constable. 24s.

THIS is a remarkable book and a very real addition to the ever-growing library of information and comment upon Juvenile Delinquency. It is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the actual problem and the means now in use to counter it; and the second devoted to those measures which the author feels might have considerable preventive value. Mr Donald Ford, who is now himself a Juvenile Court Magistrate, gained exceptional experience with delinquent children as, first Vice-Chairman and then Chairman of the L.C.C. Children's Committee. That he took his duties very seriously is proved by the fact that when Chairman of a Managing Committee of an Approved School he considered it essential to know the staff and children and constantly to visit the School.

But Mr Ford has not only experience and understanding of the problems of delinquency; he possesses the much rarer ability to feel *with* the young offender as well as *for* him and to see the adult and official world as the boy himself sees it. There is an amusing illustration of this in Chapter XII, where he describes the visit of a reporter to an Approved School in response to the remarks made by a magistrate who declared that so popular were those institutions, with their workshops, playing fields, and swimming pools, that younger brothers and sisters committed offences in order to be sent to a School of this kind. But though the reporter dilated in glowing terms on the good fortune that had befallen those lucky enough to have been committed to this Paradise, the young boy whom he addressed would have none of it! The School was, after all, not his parents' choice, nor was his place in it won by a scholarship or any praiseworthy effort. He did not mention the stigma which attaches to families in which a member has been "put away", but that

thought may well have been at the back of his mind; in any case he did not feel "free"!

In the first two chapters Mr Ford describes an actual session of a London Juvenile Court and pays a generous tribute to the insight and understanding of the Chairman and other members of the Court. Two chapters are devoted to detailed and most informative statistics about the disposal of offenders, incidence of delinquency and categories of offences, and the author then proceeds to describe and discuss the working of Probation and bestows well-earned praise upon the humanity, competence, and moral courage of men and women probation officers. He does not mention that the service owes its origin to the Police Court Mission founded by the Church of England Temperance Society in 1876 to combat the suffering and misery in drunken homes.

Mr Ford makes one surprising claim, and that is for pre-trial enquiries by probation officers, while recognizing that such procedure can be criticized on strictly legal grounds. He maintains that that is the most favourable moment at which to make contact with the family. I believe that the majority of London magistrates and probation officers take strongly the opposite view. After the finding of guilt the offender and his or her family are eagerly grateful for help and advice; they are not so bewildered or distraught as to be unable to avail themselves of the proffered assistance, and as in London practically all serious cases are remanded either on bail or in custody, the probation officer will not be called upon to give sudden advice and information to the Bench. Pre-trial enquiries may work well in individual cases, but there are parents who would bitterly resent enquiries before their child is even found guilty; and in the admittedly unlikely case of the charge being dismissed, they might well consider the intrusion unwarrantable. In rural areas, with greater distances to traverse, and probably no remand home available, pre-trial enquiries are unavoidable.

Mr Ford approves highly of the Attendance Centres in which boys usually work and receive lectures every alternate Saturday for two hours at a time on six separate occasions, but he severely criticizes the Detention Centres, apparently disregarding the opinion held by a number of Magistrates and others that this sharp, admittedly punitive, but by no means wholly unsympathetic, term of three months' training has its place in dealing with a particular type of spoilt, lazy, unco-operative delinquent. The Classifying Centre evokes his greatest enthusiasm; and indeed, the skill, sympathy, and experience demanded from its staff are of the highest order. The only possible criticism of this variety of school is that it adds one more stage to the delinquent's journey to his ultimate destination. But the vital service which it performs probably justifies this complication.

Approved Schools deservedly come in for detailed analysis and warm praise. Their function in the training of rebellious, unhappy, and deprived youth is—along with Probation—the basis of large-scale dealing with Juvenile Delinquency. (The Police Court Mission Schools are second to none in this noble and exacting work.) Probation officers

and Approved School staffs are engaged in the task that Mr Ford considers the heart and centre of mental and moral rehabilitation: the development of right human relationships. The responsibility for delinquent behaviour lies in his view on the community; he believes that morality develops in and from social situations. Insecurity, rejection, the loneliness that comes from a sense of inadequacy—these are the intolerable conditions that produce the “Teddy-Boy” mentality.

This seems rather a determinist attitude, with little scope for the “choice” that Bergson categorically demanded, and even less for the religious view of history. But since even the very good can be unduly complacent, it may be well to remind ourselves that whereas the “responsibility of the offender to the community has been long since understood, the responsibility of the community to the offender is a real innovation.” Mr Ford’s scientific approach coupled with humane understanding is most impressive.

CYNTHIA COLVILLE

SPIRITUAL HEALING

A DOCTOR’S FAITH IS CHALLENGED. By CHRISTOPHER WOODARD. Parrish. 13s. 6d.

THOSE who rejoice at the increasing co-operation between doctors and clergy will have no cause for rejoicing at the publication of *A Doctor’s Faith is Challenged*, by Christopher Woodard. His point of view is bound to be challenged, and that has evidently been the author’s experience in the past, for he complains that those who challenge him “invariably possess the ‘blind alley’ mentality”. Although his sincerity is unquestioned, he writes with considerable bitterness, and in his great pre-occupation with *bodily* sickness his writing is shot through and through with an emotional materialism.

Nearly all doctors would agree that all healing is of God, and the Christian doctor, from St Luke onwards, is certain that in his use of orthodox methods of diagnosis and treatment he is a channel of God’s Grace. Dr Paul Tournier, whose fine book *A Doctor’s Casebook in the Light of the Bible* is worthy of close study, has no doubt about it at all. Dr Woodard, on the other hand, seems to suggest that scientific medicine, as normally practised, is not necessarily in accord with the Will of God. He writes: “Great scientific advances can never take the place of the knowledge revealed through Christ Jesus”, thereby ignoring the fact that all scientific discoveries have been made and continue to be made under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The theology of the Incarnation leaves no doubt that God normally acts through the minds, bodies, wills, and skills of men and women.

Early on in the book he makes some bad-tempered references to the B.M.A. Report on Divine Healing and to the medical members of the

Archbishops' Commission. He writes of Lourdes, but omits the fact that the Bureau des Constatations there lays claim to an average of less than one miraculous healing a year. Indeed, the Roman Catholic authorities point out that they are primarily concerned with the spiritual value of the pilgrimage rather than with bodily healing.

In the first chapter, Dr Woodard claims to be able to make a differential diagnosis between "possession" and schizophrenia, but gives no points for further study by psychiatrists. Later, he gives his opinion that certain types of cancer may be caused by wrong or evil thoughts, but does not say if mice and other animals have such thoughts to account for their cancers.

Concerning one case he writes "we believed implicitly that all would come right" (by which he means bodily healing) and says that "by behaving in such an ordinary way", that is, "by surrendering Peter to a Children's Home", he had failed the boy, who afterwards died. If all healing is sacramental, does Dr Woodard ask us to believe that the validity and effectiveness of a sacrament is invalidated by the unworthiness of the minister?

Any doctor reading this book will be struck by the fact that there is little diagnostic material. At one point we read about "a lump, which looked to me to be malignant": but this is not diagnosis as his colleagues would understand it. They would demand, and rightly so, evidence from histological examination.

Chapter 6 is entitled "My Familiar Spirit". He tries to build up a case in favour of "familiar spirits" from texts in Holy Scripture which forbid any truck with such beings and then goes on to say that our Lord is a familiar spirit. Continually he speaks of "Guidance" in a Buchmanite way, notably in the final chapter, "A Talk with a Patient". At the end of the consultation he gives a laying on of hands and follows this by making the sign of the Cross on the patient's forehead. He does not tell us who gave him the authority to do these things.

NORMAN SMALL

MENTAL SICKNESS

RELIGIOUS FACTORS IN MENTAL ILLNESS. By WAYNE E. OATES. Allen and Unwin. 16s.

IN SPITE of the series "The Hurt Mind" on B.B.C. Television, it appears all too easy for most people to forget, possibly because they are thoroughly afraid of the problem, that over forty per cent of the hospital beds in this country are occupied by those who are mentally ill. This figure will undoubtedly increase, and the problem is of such gravity that every priest ought to study the means whereby he can give useful help in this situation. He can do no better than to study *Religious*

Factors in Mental Illness, an important book written by one who couples sound scholarship with a long, practical experience. It ought to be in every clerical and Theological College library and is worthy of close attention in medical schools. The Appendix should be carefully studied by those responsible for training Ordination candidates, for training in the pastoral care of the mentally ill is of the greatest importance to-day.

There is a refreshing sanity about this book. The author exhibits a notable balance of thought, is never afraid of pushing his arguments to their proper conclusion and lays about him with a vigorous charity. He insists that the priest has a proper function, as a normal part of his ministry, to co-operate with the psychiatrist concerned in medical treatment. While he never suggests they should change places, he points out that the priest, having intimate knowledge of his people, can often spot mental illness in its early stages and persuade the sick person to seek medical advice. The importance of this cannot be over-estimated, for mental illness, like cancer, is the more easily cured when treated in its early stages. Dr Oates gives an example whereby a woman "was hospitalized in a few days through the co-operation of her church, her family and the doctors. Through quick detection of her earliest symptoms her pastor enabled her to get early psychiatric treatment and in two months she was back in her home and at her work."

He is acutely conscious of the primary importance of a medical diagnosis and hits out at "faith healers" who do not know *what* they are trying to heal. He tells of those who "received real help from a combination of shock therapy, re-educational psychotherapy and religious counseling". The order is worth noting, for it is of importance. It is equally important that religious ministrations should not go by default, for at the back of many neuroses and many psychoses is, not religious mania (which does not exist) but religious "colouring" of a most unhealthy kind. The chapter entitled "Healthy and Unhealthy Religion" deserves careful study, for there is much in it for everyone. It may lead to clerical nail-biting, but no one will be any the worse for it.

The book can be faulted only in one particular. The author is Professor of Psychology of Religion and Pastoral Care at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and it is because of this, presumably, that the Sacraments are not mentioned. No one who has had any dealings with the mentally ill can doubt the efficacy of Holy Communion and the Sacrament of Penance, though it needs to be said that Penance, while of the greatest possible value in certain circumstances, is wholly dangerous when used in cases of untreated endogenous depression. This is but one of the reasons why the fullest co-operation between priest and psychiatrist is essential, lest suicide be a grim reality.

In the United States it seems quite normal for consultations to be held between the medical staff and the chaplains of mental hospitals. Why is this exceptionable in this country? One of the reasons may be, as Dr Oates points out, that "the psychiatrist rightly becomes concerned about the mental health of the minister who deals with his patients".

The author also looks at the reverse side, continuing, "likewise, the minister himself feels concern for his psychiatrist friends at the point of their personal religious needs". "Friends" is the operative word, for it is through friendship and mutual trust that co-operation will come. There is much to be learned and much to be done. Neither spiritual "lollipops" nor phenobarbitone can replace spiritual insight and wise action. This book points the way with sincerity and clarity.

NORMAN SMALL

PUBLICITY

PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE PARISH. By GEORGE ROWLES. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

THE author of this valuable little book has had considerable experience as a journalist. He therefore writes with authority on the subject of publicity, and his many contacts with the clergy have given him a good understanding of parochial life.

We all welcome the great improvement in the last few years in Church publicity, and we all know many parishes which have been most successful at it. Mr Rowles makes it clear that such publicity is not vulgarizing the Gospel but spreading it; and points out that enlisting expert lay help in this work has a value of its own, apart from practical results. Nevertheless it is undeniable that very often the advice of professional writers, journalists, publicists, and printers is not used in parish life, on the assumption that the vicar, by virtue of his office, should comprehend all these skills in himself.

Any parish which wishes for good public relations must realize that information as to the outlook and needs of its parishioners is essential if a right approach is to be made to them. So once again the laity can play a decisive part as road-wardens or group leaders, as visitors or magazine distributors, who can collect accurate and vital information which will ensure a close liaison between the clergy and parish officials, the regular attenders, the absentees, and the newcomers.

Of course publicity is useless and harmful if it is merely a signpost to lack of enthusiasm, poor worship, and poor fellowship. Then indeed it would not pay to advertise. It is nevertheless true that in the very act of publishing abroad the glories of the Gospel a great many people find an entirely new inspiration.

All parish clergy should consider this book carefully in the light of what they are doing already. Perhaps another edition would include a paragraph or so on those very important publicity agents, church posters and notice boards, and the neatness of church gardens and environs. An index should be included.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

THE THREE HOURS

GOOD FRIDAY AT ST MARGARET'S. Edited by CHARLES SMYTH. Mowbrays.
7s. 6d.

SINCE 1947 a liturgical three-hour service has been held at St Margaret's, Westminster, on Good Friday, and this book is a collection of some of the addresses which have been given then. All the contributors are professional theologians, and their contributions attain a high standard of excellence.

Canon Smyth in his introduction usefully explains the customary order in detail, and defends it against the traditional non-liturgical Three Hours. He writes so persuasively that it may be useful to propound some doubts. Is the lumping together of the three services of Mattins, Litany plus Ante-Communion, and Evensong to occupy the hours from 12 to 3 really so satisfactory? The congregation at St Margaret's has three Creeds, it has the first Good Friday Collect three times and the Lord's Prayer four times. It thanks God for bringing them to "the beginning of this day" at 12.30 in the afternoon, and prays that its darkness may be lightened only two hours after. It would be preferable to have the Offices at the ordinary times, and at noon to have the Litany and Ante-Communion with the singing of the full Passion according to St John, followed perhaps by the Reproaches. At least one of the preachers was tripped up by Canon Smyth's abbreviation of the Good Friday Gospel: the Reverend H. A. Williams followed the excellent plan of preaching on one of the lections in the three services, and chose to comment on the piercing of Christ's side in his second sermon—only to find that St John's description of it had been cut in order to avoid overlapping with the Second Lesson at Evensong.

Canon Smyth draws attention to the disappearance of the Three Hours' Devotion in the Roman Catholic Church as a result of the new *Ordo*, but misquotes the 1956 Good Friday advertisement for Westminster Cathedral in the *Times* (for "Litany" read "Liturgy", and for "Sermons" read "Sermon"); though he quotes the Farm Street advertisement accurately, it is hard to believe that in fact there was Solemn Vespers and Benediction there on Good Friday afternoon.

Will the congregation be static between 12 and 3?—that is one of the perplexities of any preacher. The Director of S.P.C.K. provided a closely knit exposition of John 16. 7-11, on Hoskyns-and-Davey lines, and clearly expected that it would; the "one-hour" worshipper would have found him hard to follow. Very different and more "popular" were the sermons on the three crosses by Professor C. F. D. Moule, who has an activist conception of Paradise, and believes that Jesus saw in the penitent thief "a great potential force for good" in the intermediate state. The Master of Selwyn comments on 1 Peter 2. 21-5, and provides many rewarding remarks insufficiently integrated together. (But why is it "not possible to experience propitiation" (p. 118) or "'mediation' with any 'immediacy' of experience" (p. 119)?) The one Oxford contributor to this otherwise Cambridge volume, the Reverend C. F. Evans, admirably

contrasts the differing approach to the Passion of Mark, Luke, and John in a few incisive sentences. Canon Smyth's own contribution is a little too studded with quotations, but these give an excuse for some characteristic footnotes. A useful study of reconciliation by the Reverend H. Chadwick concludes the volume. But the contributions of the Reverend H. A. Williams and the Reverend J. Burnaby stand out as providing mature theological reflection in the most fully digested form.

KENNETH N. ROSS

BELGIAN PASTORALIA

LE SACREMENT DE LA PÉNITENCE. By PAUL ANCIAUX. Nauwelaerts, Louvain. 80 Belgian francs.

THE book is a treatise in general on penitence, and is hardly concerned with the practice of the confessional, though in the introduction the author says: "It is through reconciliation with the Church after having expiated his sin that the baptized person is reconciled with God." There is a certain confusion caused for the English reader by the fact that *pénitence* means both penitence and penance. The author starts with a valuable, but too short, sketch of the history of penance, and deals mainly with its theology, based largely on St Thomas Aquinas. He indicates that sacramental confession is necessary for the forgiveness of mortal sin, and he frequently uses the rather peculiar phrase "destroying sin". Remorse seems to be considered as almost the same as attrition. In an appendix he treats of the development of indulgences historically, but he is not concerned with defending them. In early times absolution was not usually given until a severe penance had been completed, though this was sometimes mitigated at the intercession of the confessors in the case of the lapsed. The modern system of indulgences has grown from that fact.

LE PRÊTRE ÉDUCATEUR DES ADULTES. Etudes de pastorale, vol. 7. Nauwelaerts, Louvain. 40 Belgian francs.

"PAGES which, without any pretension to technical considerations on the problems of catechizing, offer a group reflection upon the meaning and spirit of the priest's mission to teach." The papers which compose the book were read at a conference of Belgian priests. The rôle of the priest as prophet is emphasized. He must not just instruct his people by giving them facts and dogmas. "Preaching for St Paul, the Apostles, and the Fathers, was to proclaim as a herald, a witness, and a prophet, who does not speak in his own name but in the name of God, to announce a fact, the Good News of the Kingdom; a Person, Christ crucified and risen; a mystery, the plan of God which develops through the centuries,

which the Bible and the Gospel relate; which the Incarnate Word and Redeemer realized; which the Church and we in it lives, and which must be completed by the return of the Saviour." There are valuable chapters on the work of the priest in the parish, with married people, in social organizations, and a final chapter, "What the Laity demand of the Priest". Stress is laid everywhere on charity, and education is used in the widest sense of *educare*, in spite of the fact that one of the contributors misguidedly derives it from *educere*.

FAUT-IL EN FINIR AVEC L'EGLISE? By A. de CONINCK. Nauwelaerts, Louvain. 90 Belgian francs.

THE book was written in reply to a number of questions put out in rather obscure French—"émaillé d'italianismes", as the author politely puts it—by an Italian philosophical review. The questions deal with the relationship between faith and reason, freedom in secular matters and dogma in religion, religious liberalism, the possibility of the Churches reforming themselves so as to fit in with contemporary ideologies. It asks further whether modern needs can be supplied without religion, and what are the merits and demerits of the Christian Churches in the face of civil progress. The author does his best with this somewhat vague material, but seems to have in mind disgruntled Roman Catholics rather than unbelievers. He emphasizes the necessity of faith without going very deeply into a definition of it. He points out the insistence of the Church on charity, and shows how it has practised it throughout the ages by its works of mercy. Liberalism is a word which is understood differently by different people, and on the Continent it usually signifies secularism. The writer is liberal in the ordinary English sense of the word and is respectful towards non-Roman Christians. "Christ, while guaranteeing the agelessness of the Church, only assures its infallibility in essential matters . . . It follows that each Christian generation must rethink the revelation for itself, and this work does not go on without groping and even errors." Far from withdrawing itself from the world, the Church encourages its members to take their part in the work of improving the world. In short, the answer to the title of the book is "No".

C. L. GAGE-BROWN

PASTORAL PSYCHOLOGY

PSYCHOLOGY, RELIGION, AND HUMAN NEED. A GUIDE FOR MINISTERS, DOCTORS, TEACHERS, AND SOCIAL WORKERS. By W. L. CARRINGTON. Epworth Press. 30s.

MANY, perhaps most, of the books written about Pastoralia have been based upon lectures given to theological students by priests who have a long and rich experience of parochial work. This book follows the tradition in that its author, Dr Carrington, has for sixteen years given regular courses of lectures to ordinands in Ridley College, Melbourne, courses at which theological students of many other denominations have been welcomed. What gives it an unusual position and value is that Dr Carrington, besides being a loyal and perfectly orthodox Christian, is a practising psychiatrist, writing with and making full use of a very considerable theoretical knowledge of psychological theory and an extensive experience of its application to personal needs at every level.

It need hardly be said that there is very great need for a book of this kind. So far as straightforward advice upon the general problems of pastoral work is concerned, visiting, worship, preaching and evangelism, and the like, it is just another good and well-written book. But at every point it is illuminated by the writer's psychological knowledge, which, put into plain English, means knowledge of people. Such knowledge covers a very wide range, with all of which the would-be pastor is, or at any time may be, intimately concerned. There is the psychology of the development of a full and individual personal life, from birth (and even before it) through the various stages of dependence and emancipation. I know of no book in which the reactions and responses natural to these stages are so clearly brought into relation with the problems of religious training and growth in the home and in the fellowship of the Church. There is the special and all-important subject of marriage, in which the individual man or woman finds fulfilment of the Self not within the Self but in a completing and final relationship. The psychology of marriage and the preparation for marriage, and therewith of sex in general, is here developed with practical precision and clarity, and, where need be, with charity too. Dr Carrington could not be a practising psychiatrist without being aware of hard cases. It is with that full knowledge that he points to the Christian way as providing the only secure answer to the trials and difficulties both of married life itself and of the years of wanting and waiting which are so full of temptation to most of our young folk to-day.

Naturally enough, the writer being what he is, a major section of the book is given to the management of personal interviews, it being assumed that these will have a first claim upon the pastor and indeed will be a main purpose of his ministry. Here the analysis can be worked out in three ways. There are the different types of problem in which individuals can be involved. There are the different types of individual, within the wide range of normality which constitutes the necessary basis of a stable society (since a society in which all were of one type

would be very unstable indeed). And there are the different types of transient or lasting derangements of personality which require special understanding and, very often, special and expert handling. At this point the reader will find himself involved in a study of what in America and now apparently in Australia too has come to be called "counselling", a procedure which, for all its intimacy and variety, is tending to be developed as a technique, with a science and theory of its own. He will also find that his parishioners are now often called "clients", and that there is a very definite atmosphere of the consulting-room about the whole discussion. It is tempting to go off here into a full and detailed critique of Dr Carrington's handling of this part of his thesis. But that would be to miss the point and value of what he has written. For it is precisely this kind of rather full knowledge and insight which will serve the priest, pastor, or social worker in developing not Dr Carrington's technique but his own, in showing him what he can rightly attempt within the limits of time, strength, and opportunity available to him, and in giving him the indications, perhaps the most necessary part of his equipment, which will warn him in good time of the need to call in fully competent medical or psychiatric help.

L. W. GRENSTED

MORAL WELFARE

SEX IN CHRISTIANITY AND PSYCHOANALYSIS. By WILLIAM GRAHAM COLE. Allen and Unwin. 21s.

SCHOLARLY research on human sex behaviour and its underlying motivations provides material which is of "news" value. Thus the name of the late Dr Kinsey is known in this country by many people who have read about his surveys¹ though few have actually read his reports. In the same way the scientific works of Siegmund Freud and his followers have been mediated through articles in the popular press because of their sex interest, but the number of students who have studied them is very small. In scientific objective study moral judgement plays no part. It is not surprising therefore that, when people who have been fed with knowledge which they have only partially understood and digested see the figures² for pre-marital pregnancies and illegitimate births and realize their significance, they begin to question the traditional western Christian sex morality, and to suggest that it is unrealistic.

An illustration of this is shown in recent correspondence following

¹ *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male and Sexual Behaviour in the Human Female*. Philadelphia and W. B. Saunders, London.

² Registrar General's Review of Statistics for England and Wales.

an article on unmarried parents in *The Lancet*.³ The argument was that because many young people have pre-marital sex relationships, this should be accepted as a normal pattern of behaviour, and sex education in schools should include some instruction about birth control. In other words moral standards should conform to actualities.

The appearance of Mr Cole's book is therefore opportune. His thesis is that the Christian Church has been guilty of preserving and presenting a point of view not generic to the Christian faith, and that it must share the blame for the confused and chaotic theory and practice of modern sexual morality. A major difficulty, however, is that many Christians, both clerical and lay, lack either a sound theology or accurate psychological information or both; to meet this he has attempted to give a synopsis of the historical development of ideas and attitudes in the thought of the Christian Church and in psychoanalytic traditions.

The ordinary reader will find use for his summary, even if scholars are critical of it in parts. Mr Cole traces the Christian interpretation of sex in human life as shown from the biblical records of the teaching of Jesus and St Paul, and in the theology of the early, medieval, and reformation writers, up to the content of modern Catholic and Protestant ideology. His summary of the interpretations of sex in psychoanalysis makes difficult reading for the non-specialist, but his synthesis of religious and psychoanalytic points of view is interesting and challenging.

The apologetic for Christian morality is so often weakened because it is defended on grounds of the public good or the welfare and happiness of the individual. Often it appears to be an unnatural code of conduct imposed on an unwilling human nature, instead of as what it is, namely, "an insight to be achieved"⁴—a truth which psychological knowledge could support.

The misunderstanding of the true Christian conception of sex is due to the false "dualism" which has crept into the thought and writings of the Church, the source of which was Hellenistic and pre-Christian. It is a "myth of modernity that dualistic thought springs from Christianity". Dualism regards matter—and so the human body and its sexual nature—as evil and like a tomb from which the spiritual being—the immortal soul—must be delivered. This is in fact a heresy. "The recovery of the doctrine of creation with its sense of the hallowed character of all things, great and small, is the most pressing need of modern Christendom, and it is indispensable to an adequate interpretation of sex." It remains to be seen whether or not the author's synthesis of Christian and psychological concepts will meet the intellectual difficulties of the specialists, but he has recognized the basic necessity of breaking down the barrier of the religious and scientific vocabularies. He finds this synthesis demonstrated in the way Jesus dealt with individuals, and so

³ "Unmarried Parenthood—Ecological Aspects" by Cyril Greenland, *The Lancet*, 19 and 26 January, 9, 16, and 23 February, 2, 9, 23, and 30 March, and 6 April, 1957.

⁴ F. R. Barry, *The Relevance of Christianity*. Nisbet.

the Christian interpretation of sex in the twentieth century must re-state the truth of this demonstration. Christians and psychiatrists have much to teach one another, and the mutual recognition of their respective insights ought to "lend a note of humility to any or all discussions about sex".

It is unfortunate that the author identifies sex so closely with its physical expression in coitus, and perhaps for this reason fails to draw out the full implication of the doctrine of creation, and so of the personal relation of men and women in the whole of life. The understanding of the significance of being male or female is a point of contact between the Christian theologian and the psychiatrist which he has missed. This failure may account for the inconsistency between his interpretation of mature love and the one-flesh relationship on the one hand and his readiness on the other to consider the possibility of alternatives to monogamy in a future society, "if, for example, a very large number of men should be killed in a war leaving thousands of women *doomed* to spinsterhood" (the reviewer's italics). Such pragmatism reveals a limit in his own apprehension of the Christian truth about human relations.

The value of the book is weakened by its having so few references to sources. This is frustrating to ordinary readers, and also to theologians and psychiatrists who are trying to discover and understand each other's point of view.

ENA STEEL

GREEK ORTHODOX

THE MESSAGE OF ORTHODOXY TO THE MODERN WORLD. By JEROME KOTSONIS. Athens. (In Greek, no price.)

THE PLACE OF THE LAITY WITHIN THE ECCLESIASTICAL ORGANISM, ACCORDING TO THE CANONICAL LAW OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. By JEROME KOTSONIS. Athens. (In Greek, no price.)

THESE two extended pamphlets or brochures by Archimandrite Kotsonis, Chaplain to the Royal Hellenic Household, were published last year, and carefully documented as they are, have importance primarily as Orthodox statements by one of the most competent and vital theologians of the Church of Greece to-day. They are also important for us Anglicans, with whom in the last century the Orthodox Church has had many contacts, although our direct relations with the Church of Greece have not had the closeness and intimacy (until more recent years) that have marked our brotherly friendship in Christ with the Oecumenical Throne, and with the Russian and other Slav Orthodox before the last war.

I

The author begins and ends his pamphlet on *The Message of Orthodoxy to the Modern World* with emphasis on the pastoral obligations

laid upon the clergy of the Orthodox Church to teach and guide the body of the faithful in the face of the rapidly changing world situation. There is to-day, he insists, a longing for something better, something more stable, indeed for "stability for eternity". This has been brought about by the lack of stability and permanence in a modern world that is unable to offer either. The Eastern European finds no help in this problem from the West, with its multitude of -isms, and indeed can trace the *malaise* to the loss of faith and inner lack of assurance of the West. Indeed, as regards Communism, he remarks trenchantly that a social-political system that replaces the enthusiasm of its followers by the knout, has already passed its prime, approaches extinction, and belongs to the past.

He asks therefore what the Orthodox Church has as an answer to this atmosphere of disillusion, and to the deep spiritual seeking of to-day, and points first of all to the turning of the West for inspiration to Eastern Christianity. To strengthen his case (and it is easy to do so) he proceeds, lest he be accused as an Orthodox of boasting and self-flattery, to quote the considered statements of a number of Western thinkers and scholars (chiefly English and German), with considerable cogency and force. From these, it becomes clear that the look Eastward is towards the stability of the Orthodox Church, and to her surprising power of adaptation to the conditions of her long history. That stability, the author maintains, shows itself chiefly in an insistence on dogma and doctrine: but, it is made clear, not on dogma and doctrine imposed exteriorly from above, but interiorly accepted and welling up from within the life of the Church as an ever-springing well of living water; and that conspicuously in her liturgical life. This fulness of dogmatic life is in striking contrast with the evident historical fact that while Protestantism accepted to begin with the main Christian doctrines, it has so weakened and relaxed their content as almost to empty them of meaning. But not only stability is attested by Western observers, but also inwardness, the interior sense of experiencing deeply the reality of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. Yet the author insists that the Orthodox Church has no desire to boast about her fidelity to the faith, much less to call upon other Christians to submit to her, but rather calls on them to follow along with her the ancient faith of the Apostles, which is that of the undivided Church, the faith that she believes she has been given truly to preserve. This conviction her public utterances both in Moscow in 1948 and at Evanston in 1954, have unswervingly underlined.

She believes further, that she is destined to be the bridge-church, since she understands the true principle of unity: that she is called to throw a bridge over the chasm that exists between the past and the present, and also by the application of the same principle over the differences that need bridging within the Church herself. For her unity is not a uniformity imposed from above and supported by a centralized organization and a common sacred language, but a true variety in unity, best exhibited by her capacity for expressing national and racial

differences in the one Body. Yet the author realizes that what is needed above all in his own Church is that the body of the faithful should study the problems raised to-day, and have brought home to them a sense of the mission and responsibility of the Orthodox Church. Such an education would effect two things: a greater resistance to propaganda through better knowledge of what the Church is and what she teaches, and an enhanced vitality and resistance through the teaching of her pastors.

2

The Place of the Laity begins with an exhaustive bibliography both primary and supplementary, is introduced by a comprehensive preface, and in the body of the work is divided into two parts: the first a canonical study of the basic provisions on the subject, and the second on the place in practice of the laity, in the past as well as at present, as exemplified by the place of the laity in the sanctifying, teaching, and administrative work of the Church.

To understand the relevance of the whole problem of the laity's place in the life of the Orthodox Church, it may be noted that in no other Communion has the laity so great a share and say. For reasons that her history in the Turkish Empire make clear, but which really date from the decay of the Byzantine Empire and the fateful sack of Constantinople by the Fourth Crusade, she had to look beyond her borders for the higher education both of clergy and laity, since her own great universities no longer functioned. The purity of Orthodox doctrine, as well as the methods of thought of her scholars, undoubtedly suffered through this. Indeed it is only of comparatively recent years, as she builds up once again her own centres of learning, that the native vigour that belongs to her genius and life is recovering its purity purged of foreign elements. In addition, a parochial clergy that has been and still is predominantly liturgical, and a higher clergy mainly concerned with administration, can account, at any rate to some extent, for the phenomenon of the lay theologian, a person of formative importance in the Greek Orthodox Church, and that not merely in academic life. Yet, as the author emphasizes, canonically speaking, the place of the laity can only be stated in very general terms, and indeed only categorically by definitions of what the Holy Canons lay down to be the constituting functions of the clergy, and especially of the bishop. It is true that the whole body of the faithful is constituted as "Kings and Priests to God", but the articulation of this fundamental privilege lies in the distinguishing work of the Holy Spirit, and in this the distinctions are real and clearly drawn. The approach to the problem is that of the canonist, which is Father Jerome's special *métier*. It may seem to many a desiccating one, but not necessarily so, and very clearly not so in his case. For the Holy Canons are ultimately the codifying of the conciliar decisions of the Church, and the rules of her life. It could, one may reflect, be as much the adherence to and knowledge of the great decisions of the General Councils, just as much as the knowledge of patristic Christianity, that has made the Orthodox Church what she is

to-day, has given her her peculiar distinction. It will be remembered that on the last occasion when East and West had a confrontation at the Council of Florence (1439-42), owing to the refusal of Pope Eugenius IV to have a public recitation of the former acts of the General Councils (for reasons that were obvious), the holding of the Council was delayed for some time, until a compromise was agreed on. The work of the laity in the Church is to be rightly understood only in relation to what is known and decided on by conciliar authority to be the rightful place of the bishop and the clergy. Any lay activity that contravenes this is clearly out of court. The work and place of the clergy itself is also dependent on the laity keeping to its rightful sphere and limits.

It may be added that such a seemingly negative attitude would appear to be justified. The drawing of a line in these matters, as well as in discussions on the re-union of the Church, is actually salutary, since strength is supplied to a position when it is clearly defined. Freedom of action is secured if those involved, knowing how far they can go, and no further, are assured of the value and extent of their co-operation.

Finally, it should perhaps be said in this context that there is a school of thought that, tiring of what they consider to be by now a cliché, would see in Orthodoxy not a faithful picture of the patristic and conciliar age, but rather a state of affairs comparable to our own in the late Middle Age, and like that calling for reform. A study of the author's work and exposition of the Orthodox Faith should suffice to dispel this.

AUSTIN OAKLEY

CHURCH MUSIC I

THE SELF-TAUGHT COUNTRY ORGANIST AND CHOIRMASTER. By MARMADUKE P. CONWAY. The Canterbury Press. 8s. 6d.

HERE is a book which I am sure a great number of Church musicians wish they had time to write. Dr Conway (from the wealth of his knowledge acquired over a period of more than 50 years) has written it and made a splendid job of it too.

The work is divided into two parts. First, "The Self-Taught Country Organist" and secondly, "Choir Training and Management in Small Country Churches". The reason for the book, we are told, is that "at churches in remote districts the playing of the organ and the training of the choir has usually to be left to amateurs of limited experience and technical ability". The author sets out to give only the necessary minimum of information required by the beginner. Any intelligent and interested reader could not do better than to study this little work, for in its 94 pages he will learn what to do and what to avoid. Nothing necessary seems to have escaped Dr Conway and certainly nothing unnecessary has been included. Anyone with a sound yet small knowledge of the piano can, with the guidance of this book, learn to play the

organ and to train a choir creditably. Without loss the author could not well have condensed his instructions on pedalling further, but I would still recommend a few good lessons in this department, for explanations make it sound difficult whilst demonstration shows it to be simple. Although Dr Conway is writing for the beginner he rightly insists that accuracy is of the first importance. He is never vague; we are told exactly what to do and feel in honour bound to do it. All organists know that the greatest difficulty to conquer is the tendency of the left hand to follow the bass part. There are some novel suggestions to help overcome this.

Dr Conway's book is full of hints of every kind. There are hints on style, on suitability, on the choice of stops, on accompaniment, and indeed on everything pertaining to the performance of music in church. In the matter of stop-changing, how salutary it is for us to find the balance between dullness on the one hand and self-display on the other! The last chapter on organ-playing is given over to a list of "don'ts". It is most searching and should be read by all organists for the good of their souls.

Dr Conway defines the minimum musical qualification necessary for a body of singers to call itself a choir thus: "that they must be such that they can be listened to without exciting pain or ridicule" and "they must have some sense of their limitations musically". To attain this we are given many valuable helps. Not only are we shown how to train a choir, but how to make one. There are suggestions for producing good tone and for promoting good breathing. He exhorts us in the matter of exercises with three thoughtful watch-words: "Little, often, and careful". We are told how important it is to interest a choir. The late Sir Walford Davies said to the present writer that if his choir did not look forward to the choir-practice more than to any other activity of the week he felt he had failed. So many choir-practices are dull because the choirmaster stays too long on one thing, as it were, flogging it to death. Dr Conway's readers will never do this. They will realize that a choir has to "grow" good. Patience, tact, humour, and devotion are required.

This little book is a gem. The writer brings an energetic freshness to the subject. The work of an organist and choirmaster is full of snares, but Dr Conway makes sure that *his* readers at any rate don't fall into them!

HARRY GABB

CHURCH MUSIC II

THE LORD'S PRAYER (Voice and Piano). By MICHAEL HEAD. Boosey and Hawkes. 2s. 6d.

THE BACKGROUND OF PASSION MUSIC. By BASIL SMALLMAN. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

IT IS difficult to know what to say about this song. As music it is entirely undistinguished, and it does not even exhibit the merit of an attractive vulgarity. Nor is it easy to guess the purpose for which it was written. If the tune possessed a stronger appeal, it might possibly be chosen as a comfortably pious conclusion to "Grand Hotel" on a Sunday evening. There is, however, something a little shocking in so banal a setting of the greatest prayer in the world, and also sad that it should have issued from the composer of so many charming songs.

Few of those who have been profoundly moved by the two great Passion compositions of Bach have any considerable knowledge of their historical background. This new book, written by a lecturer in music at Nottingham University, provides precisely this knowledge, and it may be warmly recommended.

The treatment is scholarly and interesting, and not too technical for an intelligent layman. The information contained is available elsewhere, but mainly scattered about in works of primary scholarship. It is here, for the first time to our knowledge, brilliantly compressed into one short book of 121 pages.

After an introductory chapter dealing briefly with the circumstances in which Bach came to compose his settings of the Passion, the author goes on to trace the origins and evolution of Passion composition in the medieval and renaissance periods. The various styles are simply and clearly described, and examples by such composers as Byrd, Vittoria, Schütz, Kuhnau, Handel, and others less generally known, are analysed at some length. The sub-title "Bach and his Predecessors" indicates the vantage-point from which the lesser known Passion compositions are considered.

One particularly impressive feature of the book is the way in which the general cultural and artistic climate is suggested within such a small framework. Not only is the history of Passion music in particular seen against the general development of musical style, but the scriptural and liturgical background is also most ably sketched. Furthermore, the continual swing of ecclesiastical opinion between what might be termed the sacramental and the puritanical attitude towards art, which has characterized the whole of church history, is well brought out, particularly in the first chapter.

On the purely musical side the author, as might be expected, is most competent. He has some important things to say about the influence upon Bach's dramatic conceptions of purely structural considerations, and there is an excellent chapter on the function of the orchestra in this type of composition. There is little said about the fascinating subject of

Bach's contrapuntal and harmonic style, but it would be ungracious to complain of this omission in reviewing a small book which contains so much valuable information. Looked at as a whole, this book is a first-rate piece of work and should appeal to all who are interested in the history of church music.

N. E. WALLBANK

CHURCH MUSIC III

MUSIC FOR HOLY WEEK. Cary & Co. 5s.

HERE we have, gathered together under one cover, the music for all the liturgical services of Holy Week. The words are in Latin throughout according to the Roman use.

The fact that the music has been arranged by the late Sir Richard Terry, who himself composed music for some of the sections, is sufficient guarantee of its suitability for the ceremonies of this solemn season. The work has been revised, in conformity with the Decree "Maxima Redemptionis" dated November 1955, by J. F. Walsh Clark.

All the settings are straightforward and within the scope of any choirs accustomed to singing plainsong and simple four-part polyphony.

HARRY GABB

DRYDEN'S THOUGHT

THE INTELLECTUAL MILIEU OF JOHN DRYDEN. Studies in some aspects of Seventeenth-Century Thought. By LOUIS I. BREDVOLD. Michigan University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 9s. 6d.

THIS book, a reissue of a work which first appeared in 1934, is an examination of the basic ideas of one of the leading literary figures of the seventeenth century and an attempt to set his ideas against the background of his times. In particular the author is concerned to rescue Dryden's reputation from the suggestion that his thought was insignificant or insincere, and to meet the charge that his conversion to the Roman Church in 1686 was the act of a trimmer. Dryden, Dr Bredvold argues, was intellectually diffident, he had a changeable mind; moreover he was sensitive to the world about him, for he believed that a poet (as distinct from a "mere poet") must not divorce himself from contemporary thought and affairs. Somewhere, then, in the climate of his times was an element which matched the cast of his mind. The search for this element has produced a study which is as illuminating for students of the religious history of the Restoration period as for the literary historian. Dr Bredvold isolates for examination the strain of

intellectual and philosophical scepticism and anti-rationalism which descends indirectly from Pyrrho and the New Academy. It was echoed in one side of Augustine's thought, reappeared as an independent phenomenon in the Middle Ages as nominalism, and came to fuller growth in the sixteenth century in Pico della Mirandola, Montaigne, and (to a lesser degree) in Pascal. In England, too, it had its devotees in the seventeenth century from Sir Thomas Browne onwards, and Dr Bredvold maintains that by 1660 it was widely diffused in influential circles. If it is true that it had the hold which is ascribed to it, it must have contributed to the cooling down of the passions of the first half of the century and to the coming of the Augustan calm.

It presented itself in another form as fideism, the argument that since Man's reason is incapable of arriving at reliable conclusions, the only refuge in religion (and politics) is the authority of governments, ecclesiastical or secular. The Anglican Church, placed between the sects and a Church claiming infallibility, could not but appeal to reason; the Roman Church likewise officially discountenanced fideistic tendencies. But, as Dr Bredvold shows, Romanist pamphleteers made wide use of fideistic argument, maintaining that the weakness of humanity must be offset by some compelling and supreme authority. Dryden, who mistrusted rationalism, fell back upon the Church of Rome.

There is a great deal of incidental information in this book which is of value for the study of the period: a chapter on Roman Catholic apologetics in the reigns of Charles II and James II, an appendix containing two letters from Justel to Henry Compton about Simon's *Critical History*, and an essay showing how deeply James II's policies divided English Roman Catholic opinion. It is a pity that Father Petre appears in a Spanish disguise as "Father Petres"; but the errors are few, and there is a useful index.

R. H. COLLIER

LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND OTHER EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

The *Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, edited by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, referred to in the Editorial of the July-September number (p. 261), is published in Great Britain by the Cambridge University Press.

